

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

IN

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

IN

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INFORMATION COLLECTED

BY A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

OF THE

BOARD OF EDUCATION

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
JANUARY, 1908

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

RESULTS OF THE INQUIRY CONDUCTED BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

On September 25, 1907, the following resolution was adopted by the Board of Education of The City of New York:

Resolved, That a Special Committee of Three be appointed by the President to inquire and report back to this Board whether the abolishment of corporal punishment in the public schools has been beneficial or detrimental in maintaining order and respect, and that the opinions of the superintendents, principals and teachers from whom inquiries may be made shall be obtained in writing.

The Special Committee was constituted as follows on October 4, 1907:

NATHAN S. JONAS, Chairman
DENNIS J. McDONALD, M. D.
GEORGE A. VANDENHOFF

On October 14, 1907, the following letter was addressed by the Committee to all superintendents and principals of schools in New York City:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Park Avenue and Fifty-ninth Street,

NEW YORK, October 14, 1907.

To All Superintendents and Principals of Schools.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The undersigned have been appointed a Committee by the Board of Education to inquire into and report whether the abolition of corporal punishment in our public schools has been beneficial or detrimental in maintaining order and respect. Will you kindly fill out the form below, answering the questions wherever possible, and adding thereto anything that you may care to tell the Committee? We will appreciate a full and free expression of opinion. Your reply will be considered *confidential*, if you so desire.

NATHAN S. JONAS, Chairman,
DENNIS J. McDONALD, M. D.,
GEORGE A. VANDENHOFF,

Committee.

1. Do you favor corporal punishment in our schools? (Answer "yes" or "no.")

2. Please give reasons for or against.

3. If your answer is "yes," please describe the form of corporal punishment preferred and the conditions under which you would have the same administered.

4. Do you find the discipline better or worse since the abolition of corporal punishment?

5. Do you believe that the knowledge on the part of pupils that no corporal punishment can be inflicted interferes with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the schools?

6. If you are opposed to corporal punishment, but believe that some other form of punishment should be devised to take its place for deterrent effect, please make suggestions.

(Sign here)

Principal, Public School.....

Borough of.....

The answers received to the foregoing questions are printed herewith. For reasons of economy in space, it has been deemed advisable not to repeat the questions; the numeral in each case indicates the question answered. Where no numerals appear no answers to specific questions were received.

In the case of schools, etc., omitted, no answers were received or the writers requested that their communications be considered confidential.

Where a school is attended by girls only, that fact is indicated.

ASSOCIATE CITY SUPERINTENDENTS

ANDREW W. EDSON, Associate City Superintendent:

October 24, 1907.

MR. NATHAN S. JONAS,

Chairman Special Committee.

MY DEAR MR. JONAS: In answer to your circular letter relative to corporal punishment in our schools, I beg leave to answer as follows: *

I do not believe that it is wise to give to principals or teachers the right to inflict corporal punishment upon children attending the public schools. It seems to me that the principal aim in school government is to train pupils to self-control, and to prompt and willing obedience. I do not believe that corporal punishment will ever lead to self-control or to willing obedience. A child may be led through fear to prompt and exact obedience, but it will be an unwilling obedience that will never be of any value to the child when he leaves school. The principal aim in all discipline is the reformation of the individual. That problem is coming more and more into evidence in all of our penal institutions. Corporal punishment will rarely, if ever, reform an individual, although it may deter him temporarily from repeating his acts of misconduct.

It seems to me that we must depend upon parents rather than upon teachers to inflict corporal punishment whenever it is needed. If permission is granted to principals and teachers to inflict corporal punishment, I predict that there will be complaints innumerable, as well as charges and law suits, and that the Board of Education will be forced by public sentiment in the near future to reconsider its action.

What teachers and principals should do above anything else at the present time is to inspire on the part of pupils a spirit of self-control and self-government.

Very sincerely yours,

ANDREW W. EDSON,

Associate City Superintendent.

CLARENCE E. MELENEY, Associate City Superintendent:

1. No.

2. I believe that corporal punishment is not a proper means to be used by a teacher to control a class, to correct improper conduct, or to inculcate right ideals. Such means have proved inadequate wherever employed. The infliction of corporal punishment by a teacher tends to alienate the pupils, to produce antagonism and resentment, and to make it harder for the teacher to win the regard of the pupils and to command their respect for the teacher's authority. It also enables a weak teacher to shift the responsibility of class management from herself to

the principal and to burden the latter with cases of discipline. It would also relieve the teacher of the thoughtful and considerate discovery and application of proper means for attaining good discipline. In short a resort to corporal punishment would still more weaken teachers who are already inefficient.

4. I believe that the discipline is much better since the abolition of corporal punishment.

5. Perhaps this may be the case with a few individuals. I have heard that boys have acted defiantly on this account, but there are proper means for bringing such rebels to a realizing sense of school authority.

6. I have no forms of punishment to suggest that are not already employed by judicious teachers. The remedy for incorrigibles is to adopt appropriate occupation in school to the needs of the child's activities, to modify the course for the individual if necessary, or to organize special classes or special schools for such cases.

EDWARD B. SHALLOW, Associate City Superintendent:

November 4, 1907.

Hon. NATHAN S. JONAS,

500 Park Avenue, Manhattan.

DEAR SIR: In response to your circular letter of October 14th, on the subject of the abolition of corporal punishment in the public schools, permit me to say:

First. That I favor corporal punishment as a means of last resort with certain pupils now attending the schools.

Second. My reasons for this are as follows:

(a) If a boy's conduct becomes intolerable in school, after all means to correct him have failed and he becomes impudent to his teacher or the principal, our only way of correcting him now is to expel him from school, place him in a truant school and support him well *at public expense*.

(b) There are certain children over whom their own parents have absolutely no control. These children cannot be reached by any kind of moral suasion. They do not know what it is to obey; they grow up in defiance of law and order, and when they leave school they attempt to break laws, and only a policeman's club can subdue them. Would it not be better as a measure of final resort to have a little cutaneous infliction on these fellows while they are in school?

(c) It seems to me that the conduct of boys and young men in public places is becoming worse as the years go on. I think this is due to the fact that the control over children in schools and homes is becoming weaker and weaker.

(d) In the former City of Brooklyn the Board of Education permitted corporal punishment in extreme cases and there was generally excellent discipline in the schools. This is true in a great number of cities in the United States at the present time.

(e) It is bad for the child himself to feel that he cannot be disciplined in any way without some formal ceremony of taking him before a district superintendent, dignifying the whole proceeding by a lot of nearly fruitless talk and proceeding, and then suspending him and committing him to a truant school, when his offense is impudence and insubordination.

(f) *The greatest argument in favor of restoring corporal punishment in the schools is this:* That at present in the Boroughs of Manhattan and The Bronx particularly, and elsewhere, class teachers are inflicting corporal punishment almost constantly. No class teacher should ever be allowed under any circumstances to lay violent hands on any child. Class teachers usually strike children on the face and head. Corporal punishment should rest entirely in the hands of the principal of the school whenever such extreme action is necessary. I fear that in many schools at the present day there is slapping of children across the faces and heads by class teachers in irate mood. This should be prohibited absolutely.

(g) There is little force in the argument against corporal punishment, namely, that it would be inflicted on children who are troubled with nervous disorders and are not accountable for their conduct in school. If need be, any child whose conduct is very bad, before he is whipped by anybody in school, might be examined by a physician as children now are before they are committed to a truant school for incorrigibility.

(h) I do believe that the knowledge on the part of pupils that no corporal punishment can be inflicted interferes with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the schools.

(i) What does a father or mother do at home when a child fails to obey the repeated commands of its parents and defies the authority of the home? What would any member of the Board of Education do in the case of impudence or insubordination from his own children? The schools and the principals, in these matters, stand *in loco parentis*. If some of those who declaim eloquently against corporal punishment had the problem of dealing with incorrigible children in close contact, they would throw their theories to the winds and whip the offenders after all other means of persuasion had failed.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD B. SHALLOW,

Associate City Superintendent.

EDWARD L. STEVENS, Associate City Superintendent:

NEW YORK, October 22, 1907.

Hon. NATHAN S. JONAS,

Chairman Special Committee.

500 Park Ave., New York City.

DEAR MR. JONAS: Your Committee on Corporal Punishment has asked my opinion concerning the advisability of returning to that means of discipline in the public schools.

In the schools of the Borough of Queens, where I was Borough Superintendent, we permitted corporal punishment. The By-Laws of the School Board were silent. So far as I am able to recall no abuse ever arose. The very fact that it could be administered acted as a deterrent. This knowledge of itself was sufficient to secure obedience to control the discipline.

I was opposed to the By-Law forbidding it. Now, after the lapse of five years, I am beginning to believe that we are getting along pretty well without it. I fear that if we should return to it greater evils might arise than those which now exist.

I am quite sure that some form of self-government would operate efficaciously in most of our high schools; but many principals are either unwilling to attempt the organization of such a plan or are absolutely indifferent.

I am,

Yours respectfully,

EDWARD L. STEVENS,

Associate City Superintendent.

GUSTAVE STRAUBENMÜLLER, Associate City Superintendent:

1. No; nor am I in favor of education *without* punishment.
2. I am opposed to the pedagogy of the rod, although I am fully conscious of a "decadence of positive authority" in all walks of life. Principally opposed because the rod has been done away with in the army, navy, most private schools, penal institutions, etc., with good effect on those institutions; also for hygienic reasons; it is usually the weak and inexperienced teacher who resorts to the rod; the whipped child does not regard his wrong act as the cause of pain, but looks upon the teacher as the cause of punishment.
4. I have never taught in a system in which it was allowed.
5. No. If he believes that *no* punishment can be inflicted, yes.
6. I believe in the application of a counter-irritant for any act of omission or commission. It may possibly take the form of atonement for the offense of the pupil by making reparation in some way, by doing

or suffering that which will be received in satisfaction for an offense or injury, by a direct service, by deprivation of rights, by curtailment of privileges, by some self-denial; social disapproval on part of class; in extreme cases, establishment of separate schools. "The punishment must work upon the will of the pupil rather than upon his hands or his hide." In conclusion, I desire to say that I spent fifteen years in the school-room as a teacher.

JOHN H. WALSH, Associate City Superintendent:

1. Yes.
2. Only way to discipline some children.
3. On the hands, administered by the principal, with the consent of the parent. All cases to be reported at once to the parent and the district superintendent.
4. Am not certain (except by hearsay).
5. I do.

DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS

D. L. BARDWELL, District Superintendent:

1. No.

2. (a) Corporal punishment is easily resorted to, consequently almost invariably it becomes the first resort instead of the theoretical and alleged "last resort."

(b) All discipline from without must lead to self-control from within or utterly fail. Discipline by corporal punishment never leads to self-restraint.

(c) The "bad boy" gets quite too many cuffs and other forms of corporal punishment now.

(d) The occasional case who might seem to be helped by corporal punishment should not stand in the way of the vastly greater number who would be injured by the restoration of corporal punishment.

(e) Corporal punishment, where resorted to, almost invariably weakens the real power and influence of the one inflicting it.

4. Certainly not worse; usually much better.

5. Yes; because unfortunately the matter has been constantly advertised and exploited by the principals and in other ways until certain children have come to feel that they are immune from any form of punishment or discipline. What is needed on this matter is a settlement and an end of investigations and discussion.

6. I certainly do not believe in a specific "some other form of punishment." Let the Board of Education adopt and maintain reasonably elastic By-Laws similar to those at present prevailing. Let it be understood that this is settled and is not to be constantly subject to discussion and revision. Then put the matter up to the teachers, principals and district superintendents to work out their salvation. It will be vastly better so for all concerned.

JOHN J. CHICKERING, District Superintendent:

1. Yes.

2. For its *moral effect*. I believe the necessity for its *actual infliction* seldom arises, but when it *does arise* it should be *thoroughly done*.

3. A rattan or rawhide in the hands of the principal.

4. Am not in a position to state intelligently—that is, to draw comparisons.

5. I certainly do. Moreover, the knowledge that corporal punishment *can* be inflicted does away largely with the necessity for it.

JOHN W. DAVIS, District Superintendent:

1. Yes.

2. In investigating this subject in Boston some four years ago, I asked the principal of one of the schools I visited, the discipline of which was most satisfactory, if he had to do much whipping. His answer was, "No, but the boy know that I have authority to use the rod, and that knowledge acts as the deterrent against bad conduct."

This also is my belief.

3. The punishment should be inflicted by the principal, in my opinion, with the rattan.

Of course there would have to be some form of report prescribed for this.

4. There is far less respect for law than there was when I, as a pupil, attended the schools. At that time the principals had authority to inflict corporal punishment.

5. Decidedly, yes.

JOHN DWYER, District Superintendent:

1. No.

2. (a) In my judgment it would not improve the discipline of our schools.

(b) Weak teachers would place too much dependence on this method of maintaining discipline.

(c) Incurribles may be dealt with in other ways.

(d) It would detract from the dignity of a principal if he were called upon to inflict corporal punishment.

4. I believe it to be satisfactory to-day in most cases. It is no worse.

5. There may be cases of this kind in certain schools. In my judgment this belief would not obtain if proper steps were taken by the principal relative to the discipline of the school.

6. I have constantly urged the principals under my charge to use freely their power of suspension. The suspended boy is sent to another school after his father signs his consent to have the boy committed in case he is again troublesome. The boy gets a parole card which he brings to this office weekly. It is very seldom that the suspended boys give any trouble on the second trial. At least ninety per cent. of our cases are reformed by this method.

EDWARD D. FARRELL, District Superintendent:

1. No.

2. See letter.

4. About the same.

5. It does.

6. See letter.

MANHATTAN, N. Y., October 21, 1907.

Hon. NATHAN S. JONAS,

Chairman Committee on Inquiry Regarding Punishments.

DEAR SIR: In order to show the reasons for my opinions set forth in the official blank, I desire to state that I passed through the elementary schools during the reign of corporal punishment. I was admitted to the gallery school and found myself seated with two hundred little boys on the west gallery. The east gallery was occupied by an equal number of girls. There seemed nothing for the children to do, so the little girls talked and the little boys teased one another. There was one teacher for the whole assemblage, and her chief employment was whipping the little children who were sent to the line in front of the gallery. These children were pulled from the gallery by officious monitors for trifling offenses.

I was filled with the fear of being pulled from my seat and placed on the line to receive the personal attention of the teacher. I began to cry and the chief monitor, Pat Sheedy, who recognized me as a boy living on his block, asked me what I was crying about. I told him I was afraid that some one would put me on the line. Thereupon he introduced me to every monitor in the room, and said he would punch the head of any boy that interfered with me. After his kindly intervention I enjoyed my stay on the gallery and exercised the right to take my friends from the bad line and thus save them from a whipping. Pat Sheedy was a stout lad of fourteen years of age who could neither read nor write, and never made any effort to learn. My influence on the galleries lasted until he got tired of coming to school.

I do not remember hearing the teacher conduct a single lesson during my stay. We were drafted off in dozens and ranged around small blackboards, and large boys from the front room taught us to spell and to read numbers. I discovered that the position of monitor was one of profit as well as of honor, and I made every effort outside of school to learn to read and write in order to become a monitor. Eventually I was promoted to the grammar school.

It seemed to me that the principal spent most of his day using the rattan. A line of boys was always waiting for him. He began at one end and, without saying a word, worked toward the other. I remember that he broke the silence once when a little boy cried inordinately. The principal asked him why he was crying and he said, "Please, mister, the teacher sent me out to ask you to come to her room." This principal was succeeded by another who took the keenest delight in whipping boys because they did not behave or because they could not or would not learn their lessons. He entered the room one day and taught a rule of arithmetic. The next day he returned and reviewed his teaching carefully and completed it to his own satisfaction. The third day he re-

turned and whipped every boy that could not get the right answer. He continued his visits and his whippings for a month.

I never knew a stupid boy that improved in his lessons through the assistance of the rod. I never knew a bad boy that was reformed by the rod. It may have had an educational value or a restraining influence, but its efficacy in these respects escaped my notice. As the classes moved forward grade by grade, the troublesome and indifferent boys disappeared from the rolls, but the rules that could be violated and the lessons that could not be learned increased from class to class, so the rod continued its rule to the threshold of the City College.

I became assistant teacher during the reign of the rod, and remained in the classroom until long after its abolition. I saw very few cases of punishment while an assistant teacher, and the effect of the punishment in these cases seldom lasted for more than a few hours. The abolition of the rod was approached by easy stages. One of these was the monthly report of the number of whippings in each department. These reports varied from one or two to several hundred cases of punishment. The principals became suspicious of the reports of their neighbors and inquired into the methods of dealing with unruly boys. It became evident that they were crowded out of the departments reporting no whippings. Strong disciplinarians among the class teachers drove them out by means of tongue thrashings. The principals drove them out by sending for the parents and threatening public suspensions. The lazy boys played truant or absented themselves from school for trifling causes. When they returned they found that their names had been stricken from the roll as non-attendants and they could not secure readmission. One batch of absentees played truant from an outlying school during the fall and early winter. They returned to school one bitterly cold day in January and resumed their places in the classroom. After a while the principal inquired where they had been during the previous weeks, and when told he ordered them all out into the woods again to remain there as long as the zero weather lasted.

The reports of punishments dwindled from month to month, not because the discipline improved, but because other methods of punishment were discovered by the teachers. A teacher of first-year pupils found that she had some troublesome boys in her class. She told them that bad boys generally ended their lives on the scaffold. The class became interested and she sketched upon the board a gibbet with a hangman and a rope and said that he was about to hang Tommy. Tommy's shrieks of terror could be heard throughout the building.

As the school accommodations did not keep pace with the increase in population during the twenty years following the abolition of the rod, it was an easy matter to fill the places of the crowd-outs. These were driven to the outlying schools, and the teachers were thus burdened with bad boys from a distance. These boys were only accepted because

the principals desired to swell their attendance so that they might receive the maximum salary. They said to visitors who saw unruly classes that they were doing a great exhausting work in taking these outcasts into their schools. To the teachers they said, "No matter how the boy behaves you must keep him until I get the maximum salary."

At present it is almost impossible to control the vicious boy. The principal may suspend him for persistent disobedience. A hearing takes place before the district superintendent. The parents defend the boy and charge the teacher and principal with unethical acts. The boy is placed in another school on probation. After a few days his conduct again becomes unbearable. He is reported to the district superintendent, who, in turn, recommends him for commitment to the Truant School. The parents fight the commitment and place the boy in a private school. In a few weeks the boy is back again to the public school. Meanwhile, the commitment paper may have been signed and he is at last placed under restraint. The case extends over so many weeks or months that his commitment loses all its value as a deterring influence upon other bad boys in the department.

The remedy for this condition of affairs is not the introduction of the rod, but the strengthening of the By-Law relating to incorrigible pupils. There should be three well-defined sections in this By-Law. The first section should be the By-Law as it now stands. The second section should be a hearing before the principal, at which the parent, pupil and the class teacher should give their testimony, and this testimony should contain the charges and specifications and the proof of the offenses, and should be recorded in an official book provided for that purpose. The boy should be returned to his class on probation.

If the boy continues his disorder he should be suspended under a third section of the By-Law, and a hearing should take place before the district superintendent. At this hearing, the parent, pupil, principal and class teacher should be present, and the record of the preceding hearing should be made a part of the testimony. The district superintendent may return the child to school if the evidence does not sustain the act of suspension, or he may be transferred to another school. If the charges are sustained, the boy should be immediately committed to the Truant School.

The poor discipline in some of the classes of the public schools cannot be charged wholly to the presence of unruly pupils. The new teachers are placed on the eligible list because of their scholastic ability. When appointed they may or may not be able to discipline a class. Many of them know that if they develop strong powers of discipline they may be placed in charge of boys. When by an internal condition of affairs in a department they find it necessary to take charge of a boys' class, they apply for a transfer to a girls' school and use every influence to secure the transfer. To remedy this unfortunate condition of affairs it would

seem advisable never to grant a permanent license until the teacher proves her ability to manage boys. To encourage them in their efforts to learn how to discipline, the present annual bonus of \$60 should be increased to, at least, \$200 in grades above the second year, and no teacher should be approved under the Davis Law for her seventh year who has not taught a boys' class for at least one year.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD D. FARRELL,

District Superintendent.

C. E. FRANKLIN, District Superintendent:

1. No. It is unnecessary.
2. (a) It is barbarous and irrational—the latter in that you punish the body for a fault of the mind.
 - (b) It never does any permanent good.
 - (c) It degrades the child and the school.
 - (d) It unfits pupils and teachers for further work for some time, for it alarms and distresses many other children.
 - (e) Being administered by teachers, it is necessarily administered by emotional, high-strung people, who are not the proper sort of people to inflict anything of the kind. The very fact that they are educators makes them emotional, high-strung and extreme.
 - (f) The sight of men and women controlling themselves and others by the exercise of their will, keeping back their passions and being guided by reason and judgment, is an example for young children which must tend, to an enormous extent, for the improvement, in these respects of the individual and for the homes which they dwell in.
4. Infinitely better.
5. No, where the principals and teachers are men and women of the character and fibre which command respect and order.
6. The agitation for a return to corporal punishment in part has its origin, first, in the natural tendency of human nature, since most children are inclined, more or less, to be mischievous and inaccurate, to turn back to the old-time way of doing things, forgetful of the reasons why we forsook them. The second reason is that the principals' and teachers' time is too much taken up with Board of Health requirements and the annually increasing and cumbersome regulations and demands for reports from the various departments and superior officers, so that the principals especially have not the time for the intelligent and rational handling of strong-willed or peculiar boys.

Then, too, many principals and special teachers are engaged in night school work and outside business enterprises. They come to their work

each day with vitality diminished and minds more or less diverted from the regular work for which they are being paid. Gradually (unconsciously, no doubt) they begin to be unable to brook with patience anything in the way of an interruption or annoyance in their day's work; they begin to look upon that regular school day's work as so many hours to be put in and gotten through with as little delay and interference as possible, that they may get out and attend to their outside business interests or earn extra money. Gradually their regular day's work becomes secondary and woe betide him who causes any considerable demand upon their time or vitality during the performance thereof.

Finally, in my judgment, most of the hue and cry for the return of corporal punishment comes from two classes of principals. First, those who were never strong in the matter of discipline and who were so far advanced in years, when this change was brought about, that they have found themselves unable to control their schools—especially when the school is large, and with the other distractions and exactions above referred to taking up so much of their time.

The second class of men are what may be described as "corn-fed" principals. These, having served the prescribed number of years as grade teachers, having duly taken up the prescribed courses and spent a year or two in coaching classes, pass the examinations for principals, are placed on the list and are appointed therefrom. These men may or may not be (but too often are not) men of breadth, of strong mental fibre, good administrative officers or persons capable of influencing by their personality boys and girls for good. The fact that they were satisfactory class teachers when they had thirty or forty children to control, with the aid of a principal; that they had good recommendations from their principals as class teachers or class disciplinarians, or that they, in the fifteen or twenty minutes that they appeared for an oral examination, made a good impression, does not insure their being successful as commanders of men and women and as leaders and controllers of boys and girls. Such of these as are weak in these respects, if put in charge of large schools, are speedily overwhelmed; their work wears on them; they become fretful; they find themselves unable to handle the many cases of discipline as they should be handled. Their extremity is increased if, in addition, they take up the work of night schools, and, in despair, they catch up the cry of the old time incompetents: "Give us back the rod."

JOHN GRIFFIN, District Superintendent:

1. Yes.

2. It is the parental and natural method. The fear of punishment is the only deterrent that restrains a wayward child. By education and association the normal child acquires a habit of well doing, but this habit is not

instinctive. In a well-disciplined school the use of the rod would be very infrequent.

3. Slapping on the hand and with moderate severity would serve every purpose. The principal, on whom alone the duty should be imposed, should record every occasion of punishment, with a brief statement of the circumstances attending the offense.

4. Much worse.

5. The number of children in a school that deserve corporal punishment is usually small, and among them are some who now boast of their immunity. Knowing this they are incited to disorder and unruly conduct, believing that this magnifies their own importance.

6. The rod should at least be in sight, if not in use.

J. H. HAAREN, District Superintendent:

1. Yes.

2. My great reason for wanting the power of corporal punishment in the school is for the effect its prompt administering would have in the few cases necessary. A second reason is that the possession of the power would be effective, even if the power were seldom or never exercised. A third reason is that prompt punishment in many cases would be the saving of many a boy.

3. I would have the punishment administered by the principal only, and never by one delegated. It should be with a leather strap or rubber hose. A prompt report should be made of every case of corporal punishment, with a detailed statement of the offense and the punishment, together with the names of the witnesses.

4. When I was transferred to this district corporal punishment had been abolished, so that I am unable to report under this heading.

5. Yes.

HENRY W. JAMESON, District Superintendent:

1. No.

2. It would serve as a temporary and most insecure prop to the teacher's authority. Since it appeals to physical pain and not to reason, it would defeat the purpose of ethical instruction.

Its effect upon the good children in a school is unwholesome.

It degrades alike the culprit punished and the teacher inflicting the punishment.

It was shown to be unnecessary in the schools of Manhattan and The Bronx before it was abolished for the whole city.

4. Better.

5. No, except in rare instances.

6. Since irregularities in attendance and misconduct are usually due to careless habits, detention for a half hour after school hours will, in most cases, effect improvement.

Inveterate cases should be dealt with by the parents, upon request of the principal of the school.

Incorrigible pupils would profit by a few months spent in a parental school or truant school.

JAMES LEE, District Superintendent:

1. No, except after an understanding with the parent.
2. (a) Principals to use the authority now possessed to suspend for incorrigibility more freely. Many boast of never suspending or of doing so infrequently. This has unfortunately led in many instances to a system of "freezing," or actually driving out pupils from the schools. These pupils thus become cases for the attendance officer and eventually, upon the complaint of these officers, cases for the officers in charge of the enforcement of the Compulsory Education Law. Once reaching this point, many teachers and principals consider their duty ended and this officer becomes the disciplinarian for the school. Many teachers and principals have come to believe that pupils must be without faults and that they do not deserve much consideration; that they must attend school and take arbitrary and unfeeling treatment *ad libitum*. There is a forgetfulness, too common, of the fact that principals and teachers have accepted positions which places them for the best part of the daily life of the pupils *in loco parentis*. There was no guarantee ever given to a principal or teacher that any or every child would not at times need some discipline, nor that tact, patience, kindness, sympathy, yes, good generalship it might be said, would not be necessary to control individual pupils. When principals and teachers were paid in accordance with the attendance there was little said about incorrigibility, non-attendance, truant schools, and corporal punishment. Many parents will not and cannot be expected to allow any one else to inflict punishment on their children. All must acknowledge, however, that the teacher and principal from the nature of the school, is *in loco parentis*. Hence, when the parent and principal and teacher agree that for the best interest of the child corporal punishment should be inflicted, it should be allowed. The moral influence of this power resting within the authority of the school will have a beneficial effect. The percentage of cases in which it would be used under conditions now existing would be comparatively small.

(b) In cases of suspension for outrageous conduct, incorrigibility or truancy, the officer charged with the enforcement of the By-Laws of the Board of Education and the provisions of the Compulsory Education Law should have more power than at present rests with him. In connection with these suspensions, principals and teachers have asserted that at the hearings they are on trial. It might be stated, too, that the parent is on trial and from the nature of the case, they are in a sense on trial. The principal and teacher have assumed the position of the parent as above stated and should show wherein any effort on their part has been a failure. The parent is not and cannot always be held blameless, of course, but there are many circumstances where the cases must be made out by the principal and the teacher.

3. From conversations had with principals and teachers who have had experience with the matter of the form of corporal punishment in Brooklyn, I would say that the kind to administer would be the style in vogue there before consolidation. No corporal punishment to be administered without an understanding with the parent and reports of all inflictions to be made by the principal to the district superintendent.

4. I was not connected with the schools when corporal punishment was abolished. I am convinced, however, that there are cases in which principals and parents can co-operate in this matter.

5. Yes. decidedly.

6. The officers mentioned above should have more immediate power to enforce the rules and regulations of the school and to compel obedience when it has been shown that parent, principal and teacher have properly exhausted every means to regulate the conduct of the accused. From experience, these officers should have the power to commit for a short period, say from three to ten days. Indeed, over night might be salutary in some cases. Principals, too, should have the power of instant suspension for flagrant offenses and the cases brought for trial at once. The power to commit for a short period would necessitate the enlargement of the present truant school, or the establishment in different districts of smaller places of reception.

C. W. LYON, District Superintendent:

1. No, except special schools. See under 6 below.

2. It would tend to counteract the good spirit which we now have in our schools. It is doubtless a conservative estimate to say that 98 per cent. of our pupils are loyal to the school. Not perfect in conduct, but, in the main, disposed to do right, and influenced in conduct by kindly respect for school authority. In most cases when a pupil is punished by whipping, the culprit has the sympathy of the other pupils. The sentiment of the children generally toward the school is hardened.

4. Decidedly better. An occasional child may give more trouble, but the spirit of willing effort on the part of the pupils generally is greatly improved.

5. No. See reply under No. 4.

6. In every district there should be a special school to which pupils could be promptly transferred as soon as it was plain that they could not be controlled under normal conditions. In these special schools the use of corporal punishment should be subject to the discretion of the principal.

WILLIAM J. O'SHEA, District Superintendent:

1. No.

2. (a) I believe the practice would be degrading to the principal.

(b) I fear that the use of the rod by some principals, though the number be few, would lead to brutality.

(c) The teacher and principal should be trained to use other and more approved ways of reaching the ordinary bad boy. The incorrigible who is beyond the control of parents and school authorities should be placed in a reform school.

4. I was not connected with the schools either as a pupil or as a teacher when corporal punishment was in vogue. Hence, I cannot compare conditions.

5. No.

6. In most instances the proper maintenance of order and respect is due to want of tact on the part of the teacher. There are some cases, however, where the incorrigibility of pupils baffles the ingenuity of the best teachers and principals and destroys the discipline of classes.

At the present time nothing can be effectively done with an INCORRIGIBLE or depraved child, unless the person in parental relation to the child gives his consent in writing to the City Superintendent to have the child committed to the Truant School (see Sec. 9 of Compulsory Education Law in connection with Sec. 48, Par. 5 of the By-Laws). After such a child has been transferred from class to class and from school to school and after other approved methods have also been employed, it frequently happens that the parent refuses the above-mentioned consent, and, since the courts will not take such cases, the wilful pupil continues to spread demoralization.

I would recommend such amendments to the sections of the By-Laws and Compulsory Education Law as will permit the City Superintendent to commit *without* the consent of parents, after a hearing has been granted by the district superintendent.

JULIA RICHMAN, District Superintendent:

1. No. Except in extreme cases in a special disciplinary school.

2. (a) It is a retrogressive step in the progress of civilization.

(b) It degrades both the pupil and the officer inflicting the punishment.

(c) To be effective it must be so severe as to run the risk of being brutal.

(d) If a deterrent, it achieves its purpose only through fear and not through the development of self-control on the part of the pupil.

4. Corporal punishment was abolished in Manhattan before I entered the school system, consequently I have no standard of comparison.

5. Possibly so, in a school where the principal and teachers have failed to establish proper standards of behavior; in a school with the right head, such knowledge in no way interferes with the proper tone of the school.

6. I believe that in these districts we have found the proper form of punishment.

When a boy is found to be persistently troublesome in his class, he is transferred to another class, under a strong, sympathetic teacher and under the special supervision of the principal. Should he again prove unruly, the principal may try him in a third class, or may transfer him to Public School 120, a school specially organized for chronic truants, "incorrigibles" and children convicted at the Children's Court. In this school the classes are small (fifteen is the maximum register); the teachers are specially chosen; the work is planned to interest the boy and arouse his ambition; plenty of shopwork and work in the gymnasium are provided; special emphasis is laid upon character building; and plenty of encouragement given to those who are sent there.

In this school an occasional flogging would be salutary. The punishment, however, should be inflicted only under the supervision of the principal, after a fair trial and public sentence. If the principal does not care to be the "public executioner" she might depute the actual chastisement to one of the men teachers or to the janitor, but in all cases should be present to see that no excessive pain be inflicted. The establishment of Public School 120 has practically solved all the serious discipline problems of this district.

A. T. SCHAUFFLER, District Superintendent:

1. Yes, under proper restrictions.

2. There are numerous cases of pupils whose home and street influences are not helpful to them and whose only conception of authority is the power to punish. As the compulsory law makes it necessary for these pupils to be retained in the schools, if not placed in a truant school, effective means for securing proper respect and obedience are absolutely necessary. Probably not more than one in fifty of these cases would require the actual application of the rod; but the fact that some one has the right to use it would be a sufficient deterrent from disobedience and insubordination.

3. The old-fashioned rattan, never applied to any part of the person where its application could, by any possibility, do serious damage. The

most important conditions are negative. Punishment should never be meted out by the individual personally aggrieved; nor at the moment of the committing of the offense; nor without a hearing before a superior; nor in public. Any rules which will avoid these conditions would be proper.

4. As corporal punishment was abolished in the old New York (now the Boroughs of Manhattan and Bronx) nearly forty years ago, and just before my connection with the schools of the city, I am not in a position to answer this question.

5. I certainly do believe that it does in a considerable number of cases. This belief is founded on observation of individual cases of incorrigible boys, and confirmed by the statements of more than one of them when questioned. For example: An Italian boy, who had been committed to the protectory, and who, after some time was paroled on the statement of Brother Leontine that he was well-behaved, immediately resumed his old attitude of defiance and disobedience when he returned to school. When asked why he did not behave in public school, but did behave when in the protectory, his answer was, "When I was bad there they licked me." Many instances of this kind might be quoted.

ALBERT SHIELS, District Superintendent:

1. No.

2. Danger of abuse.

Injustice in special cases, *e. g.*: Neurotics, defectives and similar irresponsible types.

Unfavorable reaction on those administering it.

Tending to prevent development of better methods of management.

4. I have never seen the method of corporal punishment in schools applied and have therefore no basis of experience.

5. The knowledge that there is practically no method of punishment except such slight devices as reproof and detention does interfere "with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the schools" (See 6).

6. The establishment of special classes, or schools with small classes under selected teachers, with abundant facilities for manual work, and long daily period. Pupils in such classes or schools should be carefully observed to note how far such causes of misconduct are physical. Final suspension to a parental school to be made from such special classes or schools. The present method of suspension is too drastic for ordinarily bad children, and if logically applied there would not be sufficient accommodation in our truant schools.

EDGAR DUBS SHIMER, District Superintendent:

1. No.

2. It tends to brutalize both teacher and pupil. Even in the training of horses blows are not permissible.

4. I taught in Pennsylvania in 1867 in a school in which corporal punishment was allowed. The discipline in the New York City schools was better beyond doubt when I entered service here in 1875 than in the Pennsylvania school.

5. No.

6. A well-conducted *Parental School* for incorrigibles.

SETH T. STEWART, District Superintendent:

1. No, I do not believe in corporal punishment, but I believe less in the present conditions and circumstances, as I think they are worse and more general than the implied degradation that might come through the use of corporal punishment for a few boys.

2. The State law is better than the By-Law for exceptional cases as to general relations of parent and child, teacher and pupil, etc. Universal restriction works great damage to a considerable number of boys disposed to be truants and to lead others to truancy. A small amount of corporal punishment would prevent a large amount of defiance to law, or the right to use the rod would not only restrain thousands of boys from running riot in the streets, and in many cases in the classrooms, but the very right to use it as under the present State law would do away with the necessity for using it.

A little corporal punishment would be a great blessing to many a bad boy. Sparing the rod will, under present conditions, spoil the city by giving it gradually a large number of young desperadoes, the only way to reach whom would be through the much greater curse contained in a sentence to jail or the House of Refuge. The grand jury, it seems, spends most of its time indicting young men under twenty-five. A slight deterrent at the beginning would prevent truants and wilfully defiant boys from going to such lengths as to set at naught the discipline of the schools and to require the action of the courts. An ounce of prevention would save ten pounds of cure.

3. The syllabuses, in overcrowding the course of study and the work in the classroom with a display of wealth amounting to pedantry, and beyond the possibilities of small children in many cases, divert the attention and energy of the teachers from the more essential subjects, and leave the children, to the extent of nearly one-half their number, as the city reports show, backward in their promotion subjects. Thus these syllabuses overburden the seating capacity of the schools, and practically drive the children into the streets. To this extent it is unjust to punish children for truancy unless the same shall be administered under a considerable restriction.

A number of restrictions might be suggested, but the general restriction of the law of the State would be the most efficient deterrent against inordinate use of the rod in any case by the principal who lacks judgment, and it and public opinion and the influence of district superintendents will be quite sufficient.

4. The experience of the district superintendents as shown on page 252 of the City Superintendent's report for 1906 shows in one year an increase in the number of charges of truancy and incorrigibility from 4147 cases in the year 1904-05 to 5346 cases in the year 1905-06, an increase of nearly 30 per cent.

The City Superintendent and the magistrates in the same year, according to page 251, committed to the Truant School and other institutions 757 children in the year 1904-05 and 911 in the year 1905-06, an increase of 20 per cent., while recommendations for commitment of truants by district superintendents increased in the same time from 1149 to 1522, thus making an increase of nearly 33 per cent.

The number of cases in the street, moreover, which seem to fail in reaching the records, appears to me to be much greater than ever before. To-day in a ten-minute ride on the street car I counted seventy children out of school during school hours, and not in a part-time section.

5. Yes.

6. The substitute for corporal punishment should be simpler and more practical syllabuses.

As 40 per cent. of the children are officially called backward, it is quite evident that there is a large element of discouragement and lack of interest. This acknowledgment alone affords a sufficient explanation of the increasing truancy and incorrigibility.

Simplified syllabuses, with some practical work more in the direction of manual training rather than culture as now emphasized, would largely do away with truancy and incorrigibility by making the schools more wide-awake, up-to-date and interesting to the boys than the streets now prove.

Money equal in amount to that which is necessary to build truant schools and other disciplinary institutions would construct workshops for schools in truant neighborhoods, where the boys could be educated to make and do things with their hands, as part of a system of play schools. Play at real work through part of the day would be found so interesting for these boys that, in my judgment, it would become necessary to change much of the present system to such practical lines for children, for the development of personality, rather than as at present to try to claim their attention for stilted and expensive pedantic suggestions of high culture. A false smattering makes for shallowness, and not for honesty of character. An extensive system of shops, gymnasiums, playgrounds and gardens would prove economical in saving the boys to themselves and to the city.

EDW. W. STITT, District Superintendent:

1. No.

2. Reasons against.

(a) It would be a return to the cruel control of the old-time school-master, who ruled by fear.

(b) The discipline in our schools is excellent, and needs no such harsh measures.

3. (See above.)

4. Better.

5. No. The fact that for many years there has been no corporal punishment allowed in Manhattan and The Bronx, has caused the following to occur:

(a) Teachers have learned to discipline without it.

(b) Pupils have generally learned to respect the authority of the teacher and principal.

(c) There is, therefore, no interference with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the school.

6. I do not believe that any other form of punishment need be devised, but if one is sought, let me suggest:

(a) We use successfully in this district, the plan of having disorderly and truant boys report on Saturday morning between nine and twelve o'clock, with their probation cards. Both the attendance officers are present with me at the time, and the records are carefully entered in large books. Continued poor records cause me to recommend the commitment of the pupil to the Truant School.

(b) Parents to-day do not flog enough at home. If a boy is disorderly in school, let a principal explain clearly to the parent his full duty in the matter and urge him to punish his boy when it is necessary. I would not like to see the principal have the right to do it himself.

JOSEPH S. TAYLOR, District Superintendent:

1. No.

2. My reasons are stated in my book on "Art of Class Management and Discipline," a copy of which I take the liberty of sending to the Committee.

3. I would prohibit all forms of corporal punishment, as the same is prohibited in the present By-Laws.

4. I was not a teacher in New York when it was abolished in Manhattan. I used corporal punishment as a country school teacher for four years; and I want no more.

5. No; not if the children have the proper respect for the principal. As principal of Public School 19, Manhattan, I more than once stated to the assembled school that no boy was smart enough to tempt me to touch him in the way of punishment. If teachers and principals never mention or think of physical force as a possible mode of punishment, the pupil does not have *less* but *more* respect for those in authority. Resort to corporal punishment is nearly always a confession of moral weakness and professional incompetence.

6. As I see the problem, the whole difficulty at present is the attitude of the Children's Court. Our By-Laws and the machinery for suspending children are theoretically all right; but the district superintendent is confronted by the necessity of taking cases to court if he fails to get the parents' consent for commitment. This reacts on the entire system of prosecuting incorrigible children in such a way that no principal is willing to proceed against a child by suspension unless it is a *very, very* extreme case of outrageous conduct. The superintendent is obliged to require witnesses and legal testimony to prove all charges, and even then we are generally laughed out of court. I took a boy to court for setting fire to a schoolhouse. I proved the crime, and the boy confessed. The Court said: "You won't do it again, my boy, will you?" Then he dismissed the case and sent the *boy back to the school he tried to destroy!*

BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

TRAINING SCHOOL

E. N. JONES, Principal New York Training School for Teachers, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. I believe that corporal punishment *may* be a proper and efficient means of discipline, but it is liable to such grave abuses as to render its restoration to the schools inadvisable.
4. I have no knowledge of the conditions existing prior to the abolition of corporal punishment.
5. Yes, in some cases.
6. The establishment of special schools for incorrigible pupils.

EMMA A. JOHNSON, Principal Model School, New York Training School for Teachers, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. (a) The percentage of cases which might be benefited is too small to enact a law which could easily harm many.
(b) Public opinion is against it.
(c) It shifts the responsibility of the parent.
(d) It seems a backward step.
(e) It is contrary to the teachings of close students of the child.
(f) The effect is to harden the child.
4. My experience does not cover a time when it has been allowed.
5. Not in the schools generally.
6. Impose a fine for the parents whose children are lawless. Administer the law rigidly. Increase the number of attendance officers so that cases may be dealt with immediately.

HIGH SCHOOLS

JNO. T. BUCHANAN, Principal De Witt Clinton High School, Manhattan:

NEW YORK, October 16, 1907.

To the Committee.

GENTLEMEN: I have never found in administering discipline in the high school that there was any necessity for the use of corporal punishment. I have therefore never found it necessary to discuss with the teachers any of the

questions propounded by your Committee. My views are based altogether on theoretical grounds and I judge that your Committee desires a practical discussion of the problem. I am, therefore, not answering your questions in detail.

Very respectfully,

JNO. T. BUCHANAN,

Principal.

FRANK ROLLINS, Principal Stuyvesant High School, Manhattan:

1. Yes, under most carefully made restrictions.
2. In almost every school there are some pupils to whom moral suasion and high motives do not appeal. Such remote punishment as might be inflicted by action of a court, transference to a truant school, or commitment to an institution are not immediately effective in securing obedience and good order from these pupils. The possibility of receiving corporal punishment immediately under the authority of those who have entire knowledge of the incorrigibility of the pupils would doubtless, in most cases, obviate the necessity of actually inflicting the punishment. Truant schools at present have not adequate capacity for receiving all incorrigibles. The process of commitment by the courts is slow and uncertain. It would be much better for the pupil to be compelled to yield obedience and good conduct without appeal to any authority external to the school.
3. The form of corporal punishment should be adapted to the nature of the case, and under certain broad general restrictions as to means and severity should be left to the discretion of the principal. The principal should be required to make a complete and accurate record and report of each case and should be held responsible for the proper use of this authority.
4. I have no means of answering this question, since corporal punishment has not been permitted in Manhattan during my ten years of service in the local schools.
5. I fully believe that the knowledge on the part of pupils that no corporal punishment can be inflicted interferes with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the schools. In very many cases I have heard incorrigible and disorderly pupils openly boast that they were free from the possibility of receiving corporal punishment whatever their offences might be.
6. Although not in favor of the absolute prohibition of corporal punishment, I beg leave to say under this number that I believe the power of suspension should be vested in the principal and that the pupil should gain reinstatement in the school either directly by the principal's consent after suitable reparation for past offenses and assurances for future good conduct had been made; or the pupils should gain readmission by appeal to the district superintendent in the case of the elementary schools, or to the associate city superintendent in the case of high schools. This would throw the burden of proof of suitable cause for reinstatement upon the pupil, and would avoid placing the principal on trial on equal terms with the refractory pupil.

JOHN G. WIGHT, Principal Wadleigh High School, Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. My reason does not lie against corporal punishment as such, but in the precariousness of its administration. Teachers, as experience shows, often cannot be trusted to apply the rod discreetly. If they could always be so trusted, corporal punishment would, I believe, in many cases be a wholesome influence for the control and discipline of boys, particularly in the grade schools. It is really a question of choosing between two evils, the lesser being, in my judgment, the banishment of the rod.

4. This question is not pertinent in a girls' high school.

5. Most assuredly.

6. No other single form of punishment can ordinarily have the deterrent effect of corporal punishment—in the case of a hardened, insolent pupil. A common, but very mild, punishment for a troublesome girl is detaining her after school for a certain number of days. If this proves unavailing, the parent may be called in. Suspension, to be resorted to very rarely, may be a last resort.

KATHERINE A. SPEIR, in charge of Annex to Wadleigh High School, Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. When corporal punishment is inflicted it is usually administered when the teacher is wrought up and hence is angry. Also a child who really needs corporal punishment in school is usually defective physically, and corporal punishment would tend to aggravate this.

5. No.

6. The punishment must differ according to circumstances. It is impossible to generalize.

WM. MCANDREW, Principal Washington Irving High School, Manhattan (girls only):

1. Yes.

2. (a) Saves children from lawlessness.

(b) Engenders wholesome respect for school system.

(c) Puts principal nearer in place of parent.

(d) Prevents present great waste of time in disciplinary cases.

(e) Is in accordance with teachings of greatest philosophers.

3. I would limit it only by discretion of the principal. Old Brooklyn by-law was all right.

4. Much worse.

5. Sure of it.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

BENJ. VEIT, Principal P. S. 1, B., Manhattan:

1. No.
2. (a) I object to whipping other men's children.
(b) In my experience as teacher and as pupil that form of punishment did not exist.
(c) I feel that in exposing one's self to the liability of a lawsuit for whipping there would be produced a state of mind that would interfere seriously with good school work on my part.
(d) It produces a bad spirit in the children.
4. There was never any form of corporal punishment in the schools of Manhattan since my connection with them. The discipline is not as good as it was in former years. There is more defiance of authority.
5. In the case of foreign born pupils and children of foreigners, I do.
6. I believe that persistent offenders should be placed in special schools upon the recommendation of the principal. Defiant and incorrigible boys should be expelled, and at once placed in a truant school with the parent's consent. Should the parents refuse consent, the boys should be arraigned before the Children's Court. The present method of a hearing before a district superintendent should be done away with.

MARY R. DAVIS, Principal P. S. 1, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.
4. I have never had opportunity to visit schools or note discipline where corporal punishment was in force.
5. I believe that such might be in boys' schools.
6. *Pointless* education for *large* number of pupils that must leave before 14 years of age; *large* classes under care of one teacher; *part-time* classes beyond the *first* year of school life are but a few states of things that are responsible for the present difficulties in class management.

JOHN F. REIGART, Principal P. S. 2, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes.
2. (a) A corporal stimulus is sometimes needed in case of pupils who do not respond to a higher appeal.
(b) It does not so much tend to demoralize the character of teacher and pupil as do its refined substitutes.
(c) A judicious use of direct corporal measures would tend to save many wasted years and reduce the number of backward pupils.
3. A large bodily pain which leaves no ill effect is to be preferred to any punishment which particularly affects the nerves and small muscles, as a constant position or the copying of lists of words. The courts may be resorted

to in the cases of assault, but they offer no relief for nervous and moral breakdowns caused by crude and cruel methods of discipline. The school authorities should thoroughly inspect the methods of discipline and should be able to dismiss incompetent principals and teachers.

4. I was not in the New York schools before the abolition of corporal punishment.

5. Yes. It is one of the most serious hindrances to good order. The teacher's feeling of his weakness is apt to cause an insolent attitude in his relations to the pupils.

6. I am opposed to the *use* of corporal punishment as well as to its *prohibition*. There would be less need of its use under the following conditions:

- (a) Prompt punishment of delinquent parents.
- (b) Intelligent co-operation of judiciary and school.
- (c) Authority of principal to be equal to his responsibility.
- (d) Smaller schools and smaller classes.
- (e) Intelligent manual and industrial training.

BERNARD CRONSON, Principal P. S. 3, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. My reasons were given in the report of the Male Principals' Association of Manhattan and The Bronx, in 1904, a copy of which is in my possession, and will be sent to the Committee, if desired.

3. Under form, my answer is "natural"; under condition, I respectfully refer you to the report mentioned above.

4. I have no means for comparison, as corporal punishment was abolished in Manhattan before my time.

5. I certainly do; but I desire to add that so far as my experience goes, only about 1 per cent. of the pupils is not amenable to the ordinary forms of appeal.

6. While not opposed to corporal punishment, I believe if principals were given greater latitude in discipline, the need for corporal punishment would *almost* entirely disappear.

- (a) Longer detentions.
- (b) In promotion, conduct to be a greater determining factor than lessons.
- (c) Formation of disciplinary schools, to which incorrigibles should be sent, and *without delay*.
- (d) That the police department be enlisted in cases of truancy.
- (e) Demotion, the authority of the principal to be final.

LIZZIE E. RECTOR, Principal P. S. 4, Manhattan:

1. No. About one child in every thousand, however, can be reached only through his skin.

2. In general it is degrading alike to the one who administers it and to the recipient, and tends to brutalize both.

4. Was not in the system when corporal punishment was permitted.

5. I do.

6. A small room in each building in which the pupil may be isolated until he is willing to obey the laws of the school community.

HENRY CASSIDY, Principal P. S. 5, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. Giving this power to principals would, I am sure, greatly improve the conduct of that very small proportion of our pupils who, at present, have no respect for any authority.

3. A rattan, only in cases of chronic truancy and where parental authority is entirely ignored. In this school about $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. would require any punishment, and the fact of having the power to administer it would convert them.

4. Worse.

5. Yes.

MAURICE J. THOMPSON, Principal P. S. 6, B., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. A reversion to corporal punishment would tend to substitute dependence upon it for more efficacious methods; would lead to an era of striking and cuffing on the part of incompetent disciplinarians, and would sacrifice the ideals of self-control which should be kept before our pupils, even though they are not entirely attainable. I wish to add that I am a believer in parental administration of the rod and not one of those who think that personal chastisement is necessarily brutalizing to either parent or child.

4. I cannot answer, because I have never taught where corporal punishment was administered.

5. A qualified answer is pertinent to this. I do believe that our pupils feel that there is a lack of punitive authority in the administration of the schools. Our magistrates are too lenient in cases both of incorrigibility and truancy; in consequence, district superintendents are reluctant to take cases to court; principals are loath to fall back upon the district superintendents, and the burden of the general lack of authority finally falls upon the class teacher, who resorts in desperation to primitive and unworthy methods. In many parts of our city the parents are poor and ignorant; their daily tasks engross them; and frequently they pay no attention to a request to confer with a principal or teacher. I may say that in my school (Madison avenue and 85th street) the children come from a class of parents who are deeply

interested in their welfare. I have found the problem of discipline very easy by appealing to parental co-operation. My opinions above stated are based upon hearsay and upon experience in other schools in the city.

6. (a) Classes should be smaller, with consequently increased opportunity for individual treatment.
- (b) More parental homes, or houses of detention, should be established. Conditions in these should be sufficiently rigid to give them a penal character.
- (c) Power to commit to these institutions should be given to the educational authorities instead of to the courts.
- (d) The rule forbidding the detention of pupils after 3.30 P. M. should be abolished, and the matter should be left to the principals, subject to the suggestions of their superior officers.
- (e) Teachers must be made to realize that the basic solution of the problem of discipline lies in their own personality, ability to get the respect and affection of their pupils, and power to interest them in their school work.

KATHERINE D. BLAKE, Principal P. S. 6, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. Corporal punishment brutalizes the one who inflicts it and degrades and enslaves the one on whom it is inflicted. A gentleman who is very careful in the training of his dogs told me recently that he would not permit them to be whipped as whipping broke their spirit. If it breaks the spirit of a dog, do we dare to inflict it upon the children who hold the future in their hands?

4. It was abolished in Manhattan before I began to teach. The discipline is infinitely better in those classes in which it is never used than in those in which it is now administered.

5. No. The citizen should know his rights and knowing dare to maintain them. The child should begin early to learn the laws and to respect the rights of others. This knowledge will never be imparted by the teacher who himself breaks the law by striking a child. Public opinion is more potent than any number of stripes. The true teacher gains the good will of the class and that is all that is needed as a means of discipline.

6. Before we consider the sins of the children let us mend our own sins. We sin far more against the child than it does against us. Let us not consider punishment until we have provided wholesome play in proper places for the surplus energy of the children of our city. School is the work place, but the play place is inadequate.

Suggestions to take the place for the deterrent effect of corporal punishment:

- (a) Plenty of play place in our crowded districts.
- (b) Wholesome tenement houses.

- (c) More individual instruction.
- (d) { Principals who uphold teachers.
Superintendents who uphold principals.
Courts which uphold superintendents.

WILLIAM A. KOTTMAN, Principal P. S. 7, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. Because there are usually some few boys in a class or a school to whom no other form of punishment will appeal.

3. A good sound warming administered on the buttocks. The object should be to inflict pain, not injury. Use a ruler. The punishment should never be inflicted in anger, lest the person chastising forget himself, and possibly hurt the boy.

The nature of the case would determine the conditions. Some cases should be handled in private; others, because we hope the other members of the class will profit, in public.

4. My entire school experience has been within the present limits of the Borough of Manhattan; and inasmuch as that experience began at a date subsequent to the abolition of corporal punishment in the old city of New York, I cannot answer this question.

5. I most certainly do. Boys have been known to defy their teachers and tell them the law on the subject. Per contra, the knowledge on the part of the boy that the teacher had the right to inflict corporal punishment would, in the vast majority of cases, make it unnecessary.

6. While I am not opposed to corporal punishment, I would welcome any other method that would work satisfactorily. There isn't any other at the present time. No man takes delight in inflicting pain on children, but when moral suasion and other known methods of discipline fail, then corporal punishment, always within reason, should be tried.

In my own particular school there is no trouble. Whenever a boy behaves so we can stand him no longer,—becomes, in other words, an out and out incorrigible boy, we apply to our District Superintendent, Miss Richman, for leave to transfer him to Public School No. 120, the special school which she has inaugurated. This leave is generally granted, and we, at least, are relieved from the solution of the problem. But it does not really solve the problem. It simply passes it on to the special school.

It seems to me that the establishment of similar special schools in other districts would solve the problem for those districts, so far as the regular schools are concerned.

MICHAEL E. DEVLIN, Principal P. S. 8, Manhattan:

October 18, 1907.

HON. NATHAN S. JONAS,

Hall of the Board of Education,

59th Street and Park Avenue.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned begs leave to submit that the categorical answers required in your circular letter, dated Oct. 14, 1907, would not correctly represent his attitude toward the question of corporal punishment. Let me tell you a story.

On one occasion there was an Irishman who had placed his savings in a bank. One morning, he heard that the bank was insolvent, and hurried with his bank book to draw his money. After waiting several hours in the long line of depositors, he got near the cashier's window, and saw each man promptly receiving his money as soon as his book was presented.

He suddenly thought that he might be making a mistake, so he shouted at the cashier:

"Are you shure you have my money there?"

"Yes," said the cashier, sharply.

"Then, begob," said the Milesian, "if you have it, I don't want it; but, faix, if you haven't got it, then I do want it, immejitely."

The undersigned is emphatically in favor of the teacher being *in loco parentis* with reference to the child, while the child is in his custody, and in some States the supreme court has held that such is the legal position of a principal of a public school toward every pupil of that school.

When a principal is clothed with the full authority of the parent, then I believe emphatically in moral suasion—and so does every pupil in a public school who has reached the age of reason.

Moral suasion, without the power to use an alternative, is really not moral suasion at all, and no one understands that better than the average New York boy.

The "bad boy" believes, and sometimes tells his teacher, that the reason he is not punished is because "she dassent touch him!"

The above opinion is based upon an experience covering many years, and is given frankly as your circular suggests. There is no teacher suffering in this school from insubordinate pupils. Every pupil thoroughly understands the principal, and the principal possesses the good will of every one of his pupils.

Very respectfully yours,

MICHAEL E. DEVLIN.

TERESA E. BERNHOLZ, Principal P. S. 9, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. There are certain cases of delinquents whose punishment must be both quick and physically painful to be effective. Corporal punishment

to such from the principal or district superintendent need only be administered at rare intervals, as the mere knowledge that such power is possessed will hold a child in check.

3. Such kind as would best fit the delinquent and the offense. This can only be regulated by circumstance and conditions.

4. Corporal punishment was abolished before I entered the school system.

5. Yes.

ERNEST R. BIRKINS, Principal P. S. 10, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. I regret that I am compelled to answer "yes," but I do so

(a) Because the great majority of pupils who do not need it should be protected from the outrageous misconduct of the habitual offender.

(b) Because present methods are neither deterrent nor corrective to this disturbing element which is already beyond parental control, and which, in compliance with the Compulsory Education Law, must be kept in school, refusing with a sneer to do school work, interfering with studious pupils, defying, insulting and even striking the teacher.

(c) Because it seems to offer the only hope of a deterrent and corrective influence in many a case of incipient incorrigibility.

(d) Because it is desired by parents whose children unfortunately belong to this element, and who believe that, if wisely administered at school, it will be deterrent and corrective.

3. (a) Form. Severe but never brutal; never with an edged instrument like a ruler; never upon the face, head, or vital parts.

(b) Conditions. By the principal, or by some one designated by him: never by the teacher, and never before the class; never without a competent witness; and never without a previous warning to the pupil and the parent that such action must be taken, if the offenses continue.

4. I cannot speak from experience, as corporal punishment was abolished in Manhattan prior to my commencement of service.

5. Yes, most decidedly.

6. With the permission of the Committee I desire to submit the following for consideration:

(a) Abolish the By-Law requiring the principal to give notice of his intention to suspend and empower him to suspend for one, two or three days in his discretion after warning pupil and parent, and submit his evidence in writing to the district superintendent who shall summon parent and pupil and in his discretion fine the parent; if after his return, the pupil shall continue his misconduct the principal shall expel the pupil, and the district superintendent shall impose a heavier fine upon the parent and transfer the pupil to another school.

- (b) Restore dismissal at 2 p. m. on Fridays for meritorious pupils, and dismiss the others at 3 p. m., or later.
- (c) Permit teachers, with the consent of their principals, to detain pupils later than 3.30 p. m., if necessary to secure obedience.

HESTER A. ROBERTS, Principal P. S. 10, P., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. I should feel demeaned and I believe the child would lose a certain amount of self-respect. Teachers would probably report many cases that they govern themselves now in other ways.

There are few, very few, children who are better for the use of the rod.

In this neighborhood some parents might claim a suit of assault and battery.

4. I have no recollection of corporal punishment in the schools, so cannot answer.

5. In some cases.

6. Solitary confinement, limited as to time, by law.

A fine imposed upon parents who acknowledge inability to govern their own children.

I have known of one case in which a family had to leave an apartment because a father whipped his own child. The neighbors complained. Hence in crowded sections even a parent's authority is restricted.

JOHN H. GROTECLOSS, Principal P. S. 11, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. Corporal punishment would tend to lessen respect for teachers and principal and would encourage truancy.

5. It does undoubtedly with the few vicious and cowardly pupils who fear physical pain and who dread corporal punishment.

6. I believe that some form of punishment should be devised.

ELISE W. KORNMANN, Principal P. S. 12, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. While I do not favor corporal punishment, believing that offenses which really demand it are very rare, I do believe that the principal of a school ought to have the power to use such punishments as, in his judgment, each particular case demands. The knowledge that the principal has the power to use corporal punishment would be the surest means of preventing offenses that would call for it.

4. I have not been in the system long enough to answer this question.

5. I do. In order to hold the full respect of the pupils the principal should be supreme in his school. The knowledge that there is any limit to his power must necessarily weaken his authority.

JOHN L. FRÜAUF, Principal P. S. 14, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. I believe kindness and firmness in the treatment of scholars to be the better way. I believe, however, that a few in each school should be made to feel that we have the right, even if we do not see fit to use it.
4. I believe it is better.
5. Yes, in a very few cases, in which the parents are powerless, or there are no parents.
6. I believe I possess sufficient powers under the By-Laws to treat any case brought to my notice.

MARGARET KNOX, Principal P. S. 15, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. (a) It is degrading both to child and teacher.
- (b) It is cruel—the child who seems to need it is, more often than not, suffering from a physical or mental weakness which is only aggravated by application of blows.
- (c) It puts a dangerous weapon into the hands of a poor teacher. If, under the present restraint, teachers, weak and uncontrolled, occasionally administer corporal punishment upon sudden provocation, or in the heat of passion, what might we expect if corporal punishment were made lawful?
- (d) It is a step backward toward the barbarism of the middle ages.
3. No.
4. Corporal punishment has never been allowed in any school with which I have been connected as pupil, teacher, or principal.
5. I do not believe this. I have never found that such knowledge has interfered with the discipline of my own school—whose register at present is

1605 boys in 1A–5B grades
1593 girls in 1A–6B grades
3198 total

6. It will undoubtedly appear in the cases of nine out of ten incorrigible school children that the fault lies with the parents and that corrective treatment should be applied to the latter rather than to the children.

There seems to be a lack of power in the Children's Courts or a reluctance on their part to exercise such power as they have. Would it not be possible to confer upon this Court jurisdiction over the parents of incorrigible children, to place such parents under bond to keep the peace? This would place the disagreeable responsibility where it belongs, and by the enforcement of the penalty of the bond in a few instances a wholesome realization of this responsibility would be taught.

KATHARINE A. McCANN, Principal P. S. 17, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. Discipline, I believe, can be maintained without it even where it seems to be most needed if careless parents can be forced to do their duty by their boys and if the By-Laws can be so amended as to take from the troublesome boy the knowledge of his great strength and his teacher's helplessness. To restore corporal punishment without hedging about the privilege of administering it with restrictions would entail greater troubles than those we now have; and the enumeration of restrictions would but make the troublesome boy more subtle.

4. Discipline in our schools has shown improvement generally within the past twenty-five years. This is due in my opinion to many causes apart from the question of the abolition of corporal punishment. Among these causes may be cited the sympathy between teachers and pupils, which owes its development to community of interests along social and church lines. Then, too, the closer commingling of the people who constitute our school governing and school teaching element, brought about by industrial and sociological conditions, trades unionism and fraternal societies has contributed to mutual better understanding and this has affected the conduct of our pupils. It is in districts where these things do not exist or perhaps do not count that there is trouble with the discipline.

5. Yes. This knowledge is the most potent cause of the difficulty met in maintaining order in boys' schools in some districts.

6. (a) The punishment of parents by fine for neglect of duty. Fine to be imposed by district superintendent after hearing. Legislation could probably be secured.

(b) Modification of punishments used in the army. Such punishments to be administered by persons employed for the purpose.

Suggestion: For deterrent effect it would be well to strike out of the By-Laws the provision prohibiting corporal punishment and to insert a provision as follows:

"A teacher shall not inflict injury upon a pupil. Any infraction of this provision shall, if proven, subject the offender to punishment by fine, suspension or dismissal.

"Nothing in this clause shall however be construed as prohibiting the administering of merited punishment. All understanding between the Board of Education and its employees in the matter of limitations of modes of punishment should be esoteric."

JAS. B. T. DEMAREST, Principal P. S. 19, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. While I would advise the use of rod in extreme cases only, the moral influence of this power would, I believe, be helpful in discipline. Were this power lodged with us (the principals), there would be fewer declarations of

independence, such as "don't you hit me," "you can't hit me," etc., from defiant pupils. I do not think it would be necessary to use this power often and then only with pupils under twelve years. In the four years I have been principal, I have seen several cases where the rod properly administered would have saved (in my opinion) the boy from commitment to an institution.

3. The punishment should be under the supervision of the principal, and not lodged in the hands of the class teacher. It should be given in a calm, judicial manner, not for retaliation, but for reform.

4. During the 16½ years I have taught in this city, corporal punishment has been forbidden, so I cannot express an opinion. This power was given me while I taught outside the city, and I found quite a difference when I was appointed here. Although having this power, and having several hundred pupils under my control, during the last year preceding my advent in Manhattan, I punished but two (2) pupils, and then only lightly. I am a strong believer in moral suasion backed up by power.

5. I do in some cases.

H. W. SMITH, Principal P. S. 20, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. For the reason that the present means of control in our schools are wholly inadequate to secure proper discipline and respect for authority.

3. Any form which will produce temporary physical pain, administered by the head of the school only, or by some one higher in authority—district superintendent.

4. Worse. If discipline is maintained, it is at great expense of time and energy.

5. Most emphatically it does. The expression, "Don't you do it; they can't lick," is frequently heard and shown by actions.

6. The importance of this subject leads me to the conclusion that something more should be added; and that the experience of one that has been in the system the best part of his life ought to be of some value to your Committee.

I commenced my labors in the public schools of New York City, Oct. 1, 1854. At that time the question of disciplining the schools received little or no attention. There seemed to be no occasion for any thought on the subject because it was well understood that when a child entered the public schools he must obey all regulations; and if he failed to attend properly to his duties, the principal had authority sufficient to enable him to control his pupils. Regulations made by the Board of Education placed in his hands two powerful weapons—corporal punishment and expulsion. With this condition of affairs, there was no promiscuous boxing, striking or any other corporal punishment inflicted by any one except the principal.

Since the prohibition of corporal punishment, the principal has been deprived of any effective means of maintaining discipline. A great change has taken place. Now there is promiscuous striking throughout the schools and there

always will be, unless some power is placed in the hands of the principal which will enable him to see that his orders are obeyed.

The number of children who need force to induce them to do right is very small, probably four or five per cent.; but this small number is, when not under proper control, sufficient to demoralize the class, take the time of the teacher, and deprive him or her of doing his or her class-work as it should be done.

I believe that we are doing too much for those children who do not come to school to learn, and are thus depriving the great majority of their rights. This five per cent. mentioned above frequently occupies three-fourths of the time of teacher and principal.

I think this number would be greatly diminished if the pupils understood that there is a power close at hand which can enforce obedience. Numberless instances might be given to show that absolute fear is the only thing that will bring a certain number of scholars under subjection.

Not wishing to weary your patience by a long statement, I will propose briefly two or three tentative plans which in my judgment would furnish the best means of bringing our schools under proper discipline.

- (a) Place in the hands of the principal, under strict regulations, authority to inflict corporal punishment whenever and in such manner as he in his judgment might consider proper.
- (b) Secure the written authority from the parents whenever they request the principal of the school to inflict corporal punishment. (This request is frequently made.)
- (c) Extend the authority of the principal to include control of all scholars from the time they leave home in the morning until they reach home in the afternoon.

MARY MACLAY, Principal P. S. 20, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.
2. My pupils are girls. I have, therefore, no occasion to resort to any form of corporal punishment.
4. Never having managed a school under the By-Law permitting corporal punishment, I cannot speak intelligently on this question.
5. To a certain extent I think it does in boys' schools.
6. I would suggest a school for incorrigibles under the control of the Board of Education.

JOHN DOTY, Principal P. S. 21, Manhattan:

1. Yes.
2. No body of unselected individuals can be governed without the power to compel obedience to law in cases where it is not granted willingly. No means other than corporal punishment have ever been devised so far as I

am aware. Incarceration in an institution is too severe a form of corporal punishment to be applied except as a last resort.

3. The form should be such as to produce adequate pain or discomfort without lasting injury. The right to inflict it should not be in the hands of the class teacher. Parental consent might well be required, with the alternative of summary suspension.

4. There has been no authorized corporal punishment, except occasional incarceration, since I have been employed in the schools.

5. Yes. The time of both teacher and principal is largely occupied in the futile attempts to use moral suasion where moral suasion has no effect. Children normally docile are corrupted by the example of those who constantly break the laws with impunity. Disrespect for law is engendered, and the number of offenders largely increased.

JNO. F. TOWNLEY, Principal P. S. 22, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. Experience has shown that the paroling by the Children's Court of so-called incorrigible cases has produced no good effect, whereas, in the opinion of those teachers who have had such cases, a little corporal punishment judiciously administered would have had a most salutary effect.

3. The form of corporal punishment depends altogether upon the nature of the offense committed. It should generally be a flogging administered by the parent, or, if the parent should object, by the person in charge of the school.

5. Most decidedly it does. If the pupils knew that it could be inflicted there would hardly be necessity for its infliction more than once a year, and most probably not that.

CARRIE E. KROWL, Principal P. S. 22, P., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. To be effective, the punishment should be administered as soon as the offense is committed and by the teacher in charge of the class. Under the pressure of classroom work the teacher might not always have sufficient control of herself and too lavish use of the rod would be the result. The cases that require corporal punishment are very rare and better not allow it at all than have a child suffer unjustly.

4. The law against corporal punishment has been in existence during my entire school life.

5. It is not the fact that corporal punishment is forbidden that interferes with discipline, but the knowledge possessed by all children that there is no means of punishment left in the hands of the teacher.

6. (a) Deprive a child of going home to his luncheon, provided the mother will send his lunch.

(b) Extend the period of detention after three.

(c) Require parents to come promptly when sent for. Allow the parent to administer corporal punishment if the offense warrants it.

JOSEPH D. REARDON, Principal P. S. 23, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. While I should be reluctant to employ corporal punishment under any circumstances, I believe that the present By-Law should be repealed because the matter is not one for legal enactment at all. Discipline is as essential a function of the profession as is instruction: hence the entire subject of punishment, its necessity, character, extent, administration, should be entrusted to the discretion of the principal, who should be held to a professional account for the proper exercise of such discretion.

3. A pupil found by the teacher to be unsusceptible to methods of moral suasion should be reported to the principal, who, with the assistance of the school physician, should first determine whether or not the conduct of the pupil is caused by temperamental or physiological conditions. If finally adjudged to be a case for corporal punishment, the pupils's name should be placed for an indeterminate period on a list of pupils to be subjected to corporal punishment when necessary. The principal or some teachers appointed by him should inflict the punishment.

4. Cannot say. During my connection with the schools corporal punishment has been prohibited.

5. Unquestionably. This is the strongest argument against the present By-Law.

JOHN F. WATERS, Principal P. S. 24, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. All children are more or less wilful. The greater the degree of wilfulness, the more drastic the punishment should be. The scale of punishment should be arranged from a mild admonition to a good stout rattan thrashing. Solomon said, "Spare the rod, spoil the child." I am a staunch believer in this doctrine.

3. Lying, hypocrisy of any kind, gross disobedience, truancy should be punished by whipping with a rattan. Time, after 3 P. M.—place, secluded—preferably a gymnasium. Administered by the parent under the supervision of the principal. When the parent is too weak, the principal should volunteer his services.

4. I have no information on this point. Corporal punishment has never been in existence in our schools during my twenty-two years of service. I speak from the Manhattan standpoint.

5. I should not be surprised if the knowledge that corporal punishment cannot be inflicted has an influence in some cases. When this condition prevails, I believe the parent is more at fault than the child. The spirit of bravado is probably inculcated at home. Impertinence is tolerated by the parent, with the result that the teachers are often humiliated.

6. I do not believe it is necessary to use the rod more than once or twice a year. Personally, I have never yet found a boy that I could not manage. What is lacking most in our schools is not the absence of the rod or any other form of punishment, but rather the use of tact and good sound common sense. Ninety-nine per cent. of the troubles of the teachers is traceable directly to themselves. But the 1 per cent. left for punishment should be well flogged, so that one dose would be a curative.

CHAS. C. ROBERTS, Principal P. S. 25, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. There is in our schools, especially in our locality, an immense foreign element who confound freedom as it exists here with license, and govern themselves accordingly. Because of this many of them are not amenable to kindness or moral suasion. They have no regard for order and no respect for authority. Many are encouraged in this stand by the parents themselves. In other cases the parents are entirely helpless. They tell us they can do nothing with their children. I believe it is a crime to allow well-behaved children anxious to obtain an education to be thrown into contact, day after day and week after week, with what we call the "hard cases." Then very often when the case, because of its severity, has reached the Children's Court, its disposition by the Court itself is such as to weaken the authority of the school.

3. Possibly whipping would be as good as any.

I would have it administered only as a last resort, and only by the principal or by some one delegated by the principal for that purpose. It should be the duty of the principal to be present when the punishment is inflicted. Then, I think, a written report of the number of strokes administered, together with a complete history of the case, should be kept on file in the school and a copy of the same sent to the district superintendent or the Board of Superintendents.

4. It is very much harder to discipline now than it was ten, or even five years ago.

5. That it does is a matter not of belief but of positive knowledge on my part. Time and again teachers are told by pupils that they (the teachers) dare not strike them, and if they do, they (boys) will report them to the Board of Education. This is especially true in boys' classes with women teachers. The boys are not so impertinent to the men teachers.

I fully believe that if the pupils knew that physical punishment could be inflicted for disobedience and misbehavior, the knowledge of that fact would be the greatest deterrent we could possibly have.

RUFUS A. VANCE, Principal P. S. 26, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. (a) The present rules do not permit one to use the only effective method of handling brutal and vicious boys.

- (b) Under present conditions parents are induced to administer corporal punishment. In many cases they punish without judgment.
 - (c) It is practically impossible to suspend a boy, and principals and teachers may be openly defied.
3. (a) Punish with small rubber hose.
- (b) The power should be given to principals only, who should administer punishment in the presence of witnesses. Parents should be notified of the intention.
5. It certainly does. Boys ten years of age announce that they are not afraid of the school officials since no one dare touch them. In many cases they threaten teachers.

P. H. GRÜNENTHAL, Principal P. S. 27, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. *Magister in loco parentis*. Lack of home training should be corrected; the school must make good. Obedience not gained otherwise must be forced; falsehoods must be driven out; pilfering must be stopped; stubbornness must be broken; truancy must be suppressed.

Moral suasion and love and sympathy work successfully with most children—especially those who have a well-regulated home—with very many, however, they work only for a while; when the newness has worn off, they fail; they never touched the heart; they entered but skin deep.

At about this stage, when the child is yet pliable, the time has come to apply correctives. This cannot be done at present. The children are permitted to go on. They go from bad to worse; bad examples and bad advice of older sinners are quite potent with them, and they become hardened themselves. Corporal punishment then has little or no effect.

I have little faith in later attempts of cure, but believe in timely cure and prevention.

3. Corporal punishment to be privately applied *a posteriori*—and never on head or in face—with a prescribed form of baton.

After a thorough investigation by the principal in which it must be proved that all other means, as admonitions, friendly talks, notes to parents, have failed, corporal punishment should be administered in cases of repeated acts of disobedience, stubbornness, falsehood, theft.

No corporal punishment should be administered except in the presence of the principal, and by a person of mature age and experience.

4. Corporal punishment was abolished in Manhattan about forty years ago. The discipline was better about that time than it is now. Much of the retrogression in discipline is due to the effect of the Compulsory Education Act, by virtue of which the street element and inmates of all kinds of institutions are "dumped" into the public schools.

5. Yes, decidedly so.

6. For the welfare of the school and the protection of the many good children, I suggest that in some districts schools be organized for the refractory element. These schools to be kept under stern discipline.

If this be done, the clamor for corporal punishment as a disciplinary means in all other schools will diminish to almost nothing.

Permit me to add, "I am no admirer of the rod, but am just as far from denouncing it as brutal, degrading, etc. Much of this is sentimental. The brutality does not consist in its use, but in its abuse."

I do not believe that the rod will cure the evils now existing and bring about the much wished for better discipline. The rod is claimed for that class of boys which is known as "hard cases." The application of the rod to that class of boys I consider useless. Hard cases are contaminating the better class of our boys and should be removed.

CLARA H. RAYNOR, Principal P. S. 28, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. It is humiliating for child and degrading for teacher, lowering her position with class and lessening her moral influence over them. It is apt to be administered only when teacher's temper is aroused and self-control lost.

4. I have never been in a school where corporal punishment was in use.

5. There are some pupils who presume upon the fact that the teacher can inflict no punishment of that nature, but they form a very small minority. A strong teacher does not need a rod to command respect and obedience from pupils.

6. Co-operation on part of parents; coming to the school when they are summoned; punishing their children when they are insubordinate; and feeling more strongly that their responsibility is not ended when their children are sent to school.

JAMES G. SMITH, Principal P. S. 29, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. I do not favor corporal punishment because it arouses a spirit of antagonism or revenge, and interferes with that friendly feeling that should exist between pupil and teacher, and because it is humiliating and degrading, and has a tendency to stifle that pride in himself which every one should have.

6. In the larger schools an ungraded probation class could be formed composed of the incorrigibles. A boy could be discharged from that class into his regular class when he proved that he would behave himself. The very bad cases should be sent to the Truant School for a term.

FRANK A. SCHMIDT, Principal P. S. 30, Manhattan:

1. Yes.
- [2. (a) The bad boy is in the school.
 (b) The bad boy must be controlled.
 (c) Present means of controlling him are inadequate.
 (d) Corporal punishment must be administered for his own good, and for the good of others.
 (e) The punishment must fit the offense; it must follow the offense promptly; it must be certain.
3. (a) Use a light rattan on the hand.
 (b) Use it as a last resort, and after all other means fail.
 (c) Never use it in anger.
 (d) The principal or a male teacher to use it.
4. Corporal punishment was abolished before I entered the system.
5. Yes.

MARGARET F. O'CONNELL, Principal P. S. 31, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. Punishment in school, while it should have a deterrent effect, should be chiefly for the purpose of helping, improving, ennobling the culprit. It should be of such a character as to *create the desire* to do the right, rather than to restrain through brutalizing fear. Corporal punishment has, in my opinion, only the latter effect. It establishes authority through physical fear, and fear is the most demoralizing of all the emotions. It is injurious, too, to the "whipper," for appetite grows by what it feeds on and he becomes brutalized.
4. The discipline that I have seen enforced through corporal punishment was hard, harsh, unsympathetic, lacking in moral elevation and inspiration, and inferior in every particular to the discipline now to be found in our best schools.
5. No. Four of our recent English visitors, three of them headmasters and one a supervisor, were unanimous in their tribute of praise to the discipline of the American public schools on the occasion of their visit here, November 26, 1906. Their verdict was "How good your American boys are; they seem to want to do what you want them to do; they are heartily in accord with you; they are alert, deeply interested, yet courteous and self-controlled; everything seems so easy, so natural; you seem to require no effort at all. It is a revelation to us, and would be quite impossible on our side of the ocean. How do you accomplish it?"
6. With perhaps the exception of cases of chronic truancy and incorrigibility, the means at our disposal for maintaining a high order of discipline are entirely sufficient. Regarding the above exceptions, it seems to me that these unfortunates would be greatly benefited by the establishment of a sympathetic co-operation on a larger or more extended scale between the schools and the various children's aid societies, courts, institutions, etc.

SAM'L AYERS, Principal P. S. 32, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. (a) I am thoroughly convinced by past experience, of its salutary and saving effects upon the boy.

(b) Because it seems to be in some cases, at least, the only means of teaching some pupils a wholesome and necessary respect for and obedience to law.

(c) Because there are cases in which moral suasion seems to be, and is, for all practical purposes, insufficient and inadequate to hold the pupil to the proper state of discipline.

(d) And there are other reasons.

3. I would use a rattan having the diameter of an ordinary lead pencil, and I would use it across the fingers of the left hand. If this be insufficient to subdue a pupil, after a fair trial, I doubt if any form of corporal punishment will. No brutalizing form of corporal punishment should be tolerated. Many parents resort to punishment which is brutalizing. These are the cases which give us the most trouble. What impression can be made upon a boy so brutalized?

(a) That the parent give his written consent.

(b) On condition that the ordinary forms of punishment have proved inefficient.

(c) When the parent, especially a widowed mother who is compelled to go out to work daily, has not the time to look after her boy as she could.

(d) In cases of incipient truancy.

4. I am not prepared to say that the discipline is better or worse on account of the abolition of corporal punishment. But I feel that I am justified in saying that proper discipline is maintained at a great cost of energy and nerve power on the part of the teacher, and a great waste of time on the part of the class, the principal and the parent. I am strongly of the opinion that truancy has considerably, if not largely, increased since the abolition of the use of the rod. I have no recollection of such gangs of boys roving our streets holding up good pupils, robbing them upon the street, or in the yards, and on the stairways of the building, and beating them with a slung shot if they resist, in the days when the rod was used.

5. I believe such knowledge makes the discipline more difficult. I also believe that the mere knowledge on the part of the pupil that corporal punishment could be inflicted would make the enforcement of discipline much easier, and save a great amount of energy, time and patience of all concerned in the welfare of the pupil.

ELIZABETH C. O'ROURKE, Principal P. S. 32, P., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. For more than twenty years I taught classes of boys and for more than twelve years have been principal of a boys' and girls' primary department,

and have always been able to maintain excellent discipline without the use of corporal punishment. I consider it degrading to the one who receives it and to the one who administers it.

5. I believe if refractory pupils knew that corporal punishment *might* be inflicted, it would have a beneficial effect.

6. Responsibility should be placed on parents.

ALIDA S. WILLIAMS, Principal P. S. 33, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. The power of the principal to compel obedience on the part of mutinous pupils to their teachers is now too limited. In fact it is non-existent. Corporal punishment is the simplest, least harmful, most logical method of securing this obedience. I say "most logical" because all through nature we observe the deterrent power of physical pain employed to prevent violation of law, and it is a safe example for us to follow.

3. The old-fashioned use of the flat ruler upon the palms of the hands is the least objectionable form of executing an unpleasant duty. The punishment should be administered in private, and the day after the offense is committed or proved to have been committed. Everything should be done to make the infliction a judicial retribution, not a personal revenge or a public humiliation. I should limit the power of inflicting this form of punishment to the principal or to some teacher designated by him who must inflict it in the principal's presence.

4. Worse. And secured, even in its deteriorated form, at the expenditure of more nervous energy, at the cost of more dishonest devices to "dodge" the By-Laws than such discipline is worth.

5. Undoubtedly. It must not be overlooked that only a small but very active, in some cases vicious, minority now require an application, occasional but energetic, of the rod. The mass of the children are docile, and it is only fair to them to compel the few rebels to refrain from wasting the time of the law-abiding. The mutinous minority would be decreased in number by the knowledge that they could and would be whipped if they made this necessary. The ugly-tempered, defiant, immoral and stubborn remnant should be forced to submit to legally constituted authority, the first and most valuable lesson which the schools have to teach. In the last analysis we adults yield our wills to force also, or to the conviction that if we do not yield them society will compel us to do so. Society has so many worse punishments for us than the rod that corporal punishment is no longer used for us luckless grown-ups, but it should be applied in mercy to children who defy law in order that they may not, when arrived at manhood or womanhood, learn by bitter experience what these worse reserves of punishments are.

Children have an "inalienable right" to be compelled to obey those who are older and wiser than themselves, and if this obedience is not cheerfully and willingly forthcoming it should be secured, even at the cost of a little

pain to them. They should not be coaxed, bribed, wheedled or tricked into obedience, though their reason and conscience should be appealed to before the final resort to compulsion is made. These appeals are always made now by patient, longsuffering teachers, and in some instances, vainly. What is to be done now with our defiant or indecent rebels? I assure you that they are not all physically deficient, as recent interviews with sentimentalists have set forth, and the rod, wisely applied, would work a most pleasing and speedy reformation.

CHRISSIE I. HALLER, Asst. to Principal P. S. 33, Manhattan:

1. Yes; in extreme cases.
2. In incorrigible cases only, when the child is so hardened that there is nothing to appeal to in him, the infliction of corporal punishment may so impress him that there would be no repetition of his offense.
3. The form of corporal punishment would depend, in a great measure, on the nature of the offense, and would be best administered by the parent in the presence of the principal or person in authority.
4. Discipline has not deteriorated in Public School 33 since the abolition of corporal punishment.
5. Yes; depraved children instigate others to commit acts of disobedience by their example, knowing that the teacher has little or no means of correcting them.
6. Detention after 3 P. M. with plenty of work to keep him busy, and that work accepted only if done to the best of his ability; also placing an incorrigible boy in a girls' class temporarily; these often produce excellent results.

ISRAEL EDWIN GOLDWASSER, Principal P. S. 34, Manhattan:

1. Yes.
2. (a) There are cases of emergency where immediate personal chastisement is the only course open.
(b) There are types of boy-nature which require a substratum of fear before any higher feelings can be developed.
(c) There are certain offences in which the only logical punishment is corporal punishment.
3. (a) Direct personal chastisement.
(b) By the principal.
(c) After a full hearing and exhausting all other modes of correction.
4. I never had experience under the older system.
5. Yes, decidedly.

MARGARET P. DUGGAN, Principal P. S. 37, Manhattan:

1. No.
4. I was not in the system when corporal punishment was used.
5. Yes.

IDA B. LINDHEIMER, Principal P. S. 38, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. (a) It is degrading to the person inflicting the punishment.
(b) It interferes with that feeling of good will which should exist in the heart of the teacher toward the child, and in the heart of the child toward the teacher.
4. I have no means of making comparisons, as corporal punishment has never been permitted since my appointment to the public schools.
5. To a certain extent. It has its influence upon that very small percentage of children who are affected by nothing but physical pain.
6. I believe in corporal punishment to be administered by a Children's Court, for certain misdemeanors whether committed in school or out of school.

THEO. B. BARRINGER, Principal P. S. 39, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes and No.
2. Yes. This answer is conditioned upon the pupil's thorough acquaintance, at the time he committed the offense, with the nature of his act and the penalty attached to its commitment, and it must not be inflicted until other correctional methods shall have been tried and found wanting.

The best authorities recognize the aid of the inflictive pain in the training of young animals. Animal instincts dominate the child until reason begins to assert itself, which is about the age of ten and is intermittent until the child is along in its teens. Again, all down the ages corporal punishment has been accepted as an effective penalty for wrong doing and an aid to right-doing.

No. This answer is conditioned upon the morale of the school,—if the atmosphere of the school and class is such as to segregate the delinquents in the school so that their influence is entirely negative, and provided the delinquent, when he becomes an incorrigible, be surely and promptly placed in a home for correction under the Board of Education.

3. I consider the best form of corporal punishment to be the use of a thin, flexible strap applied to the finger tips, the wielder to hold the boys' hand firm with palm up, by grasping it by the wrist with the back of his hand up.

4. I was not in the system when corporal punishment obtained. It is possible the discipline is not as good as it was ten years ago, for then the troublesome boy was driven into the street while now he is driven into the school.

5. I do not believe that the knowledge on the part of the pupil that his misconduct cannot be corrected by corporal punishment influences his action or conduct. Offenses which corporal punishment would seek to prevent are not meditative, but the result of impulse.

MARIETTA A. CLARK, Principal P. S. 39, P., Manhattan:

1. No.
2. It has a demoralizing effect and it is a privilege that is very apt to be abused.
4. Worse.
5. The children certainly take advantage because they know that there is no adequate punishment.
6. Instead of devising means of punishing I would sooner suggest that we be allowed to reward the children.

JOSEPH K. VAN DENBURG, Principal P. S. 40, Manhattan:

1. No, not in *all* schools.
2. Correction and punishment should naturally come from the parents. The parents may usually be depended on to do the right thing, but in some cases they do not know how to punish their children and strike or beat them unmercifully. It would be a mercy to have these boys whipped in some school rather than at home.
3. The principal should have the power to have the defiant boy whipped in school by the boy's parents if necessary. Boys whose conduct is consistently insubordinate and defiant should be segregated in special day schools or special classes where whipping is permitted.
4. I do not know.
5. In the case of the persistently defiant and truant boys, their defiant attitude is often strengthened by the knowledge that they cannot be whipped, either at home or in school. Frequently they are sons of widows who have no physical control over their boys. The boys have been spoiled by lack of proper correction at home.
6. For the protection of the great number of boys who are regular in attendance and satisfactory in conduct and studies, there ought to be some means of isolating the one per cent. who are more or less incurably bad. This bad element is not amenable to the same treatment that is given the normal or average boy. For this apparently vicious element, special classes or special schools should be organized where whippings (when they cannot be administered by the parent) may be administered by some specially designated officer of the school.

Oct. 16, 1907.

Hon. NATHAN S. JONAS,

Chairman, Special Committee.

500 Park Ave., N. Y. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your suggestion, I am adding to my direct answers to your questions, other information and opinions upon the very important and difficult subject you are now investigating:

1. The Children's Court, if properly administered, would be a powerful means of securing good behavior from the worst boys in the school. As at present administered, it is apparently useless or worse than useless. So far as my extremely limited experience goes, it does as much harm as good. I wish that your Committee would send a responsible but unknown visitor in shabby dress to the Court just to see during the course of a week what goes on there.

2. In the course of a year, we get probably more than a hundred letters or notes begging us to punish the children on the ground that the mother is too weak to do it herself or that the father may cripple or kill the boy if he should undertake to do the whipping.

3. The Truant School and Catholic Protectory help take care of the very worst cases, but these schools do not *cure* ill behavior or truancy as a rule. The long term (two years) of commitment necessary under the law makes it unwise to "send up" the occasional truant or sporadically bad boy who causes much of the disorder in the school. For this boy, whose parents cannot or will not control him, there should be some short term class or school where an officer can supply the strong and temperate control which the boy needs, but which he does not get at home, and so save him before it is too late.

4. The summing up of the whole situation is this: It is the *PARENTS'* duty to see that their boys attend school and behave themselves. If the boy is constantly disorderly or a truant, the *PARENTS* must be called upon to correct or punish their child. Moreover, the parent must whip the child if the teacher can show the necessity for the whipping. For parents who cannot rule their children, who punish never, or too much, the law as administered in the Children's Court should provide. Many a boy is ruined by punishment too severely given; but more are spoiled by punishment omitted. The teacher is often the one best fitted to prescribe the punishment which the parent should carry out. *A teacher may be strengthened BY HAVING THE RIGHT TO WHIP* a boy, but no teacher or principal should actually do the whipping.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH K. VAN DENBURG.

KATHERINE BEVIER, Principal P. S. 41, Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. I believe that corporal punishment is of doubtful benefit anywhere.

4. It has not been in use in Manhattan since I began to teach.

5. I believe that in some sections of the City the knowledge that no adequate punishment can be inflicted does interfere as stated above. In my own school there is no trouble.

6. Where the unruliness of a pupil interferes with order of the school, if the parent *cannot* make him reform the child should be sent to a school of

disciplinary character established to deal with such cases. If the parent *will not* endeavor to make his child respectful and obedient, a fine might be imposed by the proper authorities. I believe the latter plan would bring about many reforms.

W. H. J. SIEBERG, Principal P. S. 43, Gr., Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. While in sentiment I am against it, in practice I have found it to work disastrously. The boys are not generally of such delicate susceptibility as to appreciate the reason for not physically punishing them, and regard their teachers as "softies" whom they can disobey at will and defy. The result is a general disrespect for authority, for age, for parents.

3. Plainly, the rod, used, by the principal only, seldom and sparingly, but instantly, when occasion demands it.

4. Very much worse and much more difficult.

5. Decidedly yes. And, while on this topic, allow me to express the regret that, while in a number of European countries the authorities are inclined to adopt American methods, they are in danger of adopting the bad with the good, our method of "moral suasion" with the rest. The young street ruffian is now almost, if not entirely, unknown there; with the adoption of "moral suasion" their streets will soon be filled with young loafers as now, they say, ours are.

E. R. MAGUIRE, Principal P. S. 44, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. (a) Unnecessary.

(b) Would only be used by incompetent teachers.

(c) Appeals to fear, not to reason.

(d) Hence, will produce deceit to escape it.

(e) School not a place for the infliction of punishment, and if properly managed the use of punishment will not be called for.

4. I never taught where corporal punishment was allowed.

5. In a badly organized school I can readily see that such knowledge might interfere with maintenance of order. In a well managed school I do not believe that such knowledge enters into the matter.

6. If the activities of the school are so organized that it is a pleasure for the children to take part in them there is a two-fold benefit:

(a) The matter of punishment will be largely a negligible quantity.

(b) Deprivation of his right to take part in these activities of the school life will be punishment enough.

This is almost entirely in the hands of the principal.

MARY E. TATE, Principal P. S. 45, Gr., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. In answering "No" to the previous question, I am simply expressing my opinion in regard to my own department, *where I have no difficulty with the discipline*; but, when my graduates who have been appointed in certain schools, return to me and tell me of the inexpressibly vulgar remarks which are made to them by some of their pupils and, in addition to this, I see the nervous condition to which some of them are reduced in an effort to manage incorrigible pupils, who do not hesitate to inflict corporal punishment on the teacher, I most emphatically favor some mode of punishment which will work a much needed change in certain directions. Even if the child is incorrigible, fear may make him outwardly subservient, and thereby prevent the demoralizing effect of wrong example.

4. I have never had any trouble with the discipline of my department.

SARAH E. COLEY, Principal P. S. 45, P., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. Possible brutality in administering it.

4. Worse, in schools at large.

5. I do.

6. Remove them from detrimental surroundings by placing them under military discipline in some institution or colony, devoted to that work.

WILLIAM A. BOYLAN, Principal P. S. 46, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. It should be used as a last resource only. The disciplinary school has not been tried as yet.

4. Corporal punishment has not been employed in Manhattan since my entrance into the system.

5. I believe that the knowledge on the part of the pupils that we have no adequate means of punishment makes the proper maintenance of order and respect very difficult.

6. I think that there should be disciplinary schools to which the *principal* might send disorderly pupils. The term might vary from twenty-four hours to several months, according to the offense. Disciplinary schools would differ from the parental school in that there would be several of the former, that the method of commitment would be more simple and direct, and largely in the hands of the principal and the term of commitment on the average much briefer. There is no doubt in my mind that if provision were made for the disorderly pupil, about one in every hundred, the efficiency of the schools would be much increased.

SADIA E. BAIRD, Principal P. S. 48, Manhattan:

1. No, unless under certain conditions.
2. It is too often unwisely administered. In many cases tends to bring out the worst in the child's disposition.
3. Central schools might be established where incorrigibles should be sent, and where corporal punishment might be judiciously administered.
4. Have had no experience where it was administered.
5. Yes, decidedly. Only this week a boy threatened to "tell his father, and make the teacher lose her job," if she touched him. Such a speech before the class is certainly demoralizing.
6. Sending pupils to an empty room, to remain in solitude by the hour, with absolutely no employment nor amusement. Also the detention of pupils after 3.30 P. M. when necessary, as being kept such a short time makes very little impression.

WILLIAM F. KURZ, Principal P. S. 49, Manhattan:

1. In the main,—No!
2. Effects of corporal punishment—
 - (a) On the child:
 - (1) Physically—It is apt to maim or cripple child if inflicted during a fit of temper on part of one punishing.
 - (2) Intellectually—It causes the child to carry over the feeling against the punisher to the subjects taught.
 - (3) Morally—It does not prepare for life—punishment in life does not follow the lines of corporal punishment.
 - (b) On teacher:
 - (1) Tends to make him a barbarian instead of humane, guiding and sympathetic.
 - (2) Degrades him instead of uplifting him.
 - (3) Loses hold on child, for child is not developed sufficiently to understand that teacher is "*in loco parentis*."
4. I cannot answer this, owing to the fact that, during my career as pupil teacher and principal in our schools, corporal punishment was forbidden.
5. Yes! With some pupils corporal punishment seems to have the proper deterrent effect after all other means have failed. This is especially true in certain New York districts where that form of punishment is about the only one resorted to in the home. The habit has been formed, and attempts at correction through means other than corporal punishment are a dismal failure. In these pupils a knowledge of the fact that corporal punishment may be inflicted is the only solution. If used in such cases, it will have the proper deterrent effect upon other cases that might otherwise become unruly.

6. (a) In any school the number of pupils needing corporal punishment to keep them within the straight, narrow path of proper discipline is limited. It seems to me that it is the duty of every principal to sift out the incorrigibles and to have them sent to a school where corporal punishment should be resorted to to bring about wholesome results.
- (b) For the rest of the pupils, I believe that the most effective form of punishment is that where privileges once granted are taken away because the child has violated rules of the school.

CAROLINE EMANUEL, Principal P. S. 50, Manhattan (girls only):

1. No!
2. (a) Corporal punishment is not reformatory. It may *cow*, but never *elevates*.
- (b) If necessary at all, it should be inflicted *at home*, but not in school.
- (c) If sanctioned, it would be subject to abuse and excess.
4. It may be worse in individual cases, but the whole tone of the schools has been raised.
5. In a girls' school, like my own, the question of discipline rarely enters. It was, however, my privilege for many years, to teach a graduating class of boys and girls in The Bronx, where it was no more difficult to rule one sex than the other by firm, but kindly, "moral suasion."
6. (a) The parent, by *fine*, should be held responsible for the misconduct of a minor.
- (b) It should be possible to segregate, in some place or places set apart for that purpose, those boys who do not yield to the plan of moral suasion or self-government.

GEORGE H. CHATFIELD, Principal P. S. 51, Manhattan:

1. I do not care to give a categorical answer. No, decidedly, if conditions can be changed.
2. Corporal punishment is ineffective with very many pupils; with some it is effective. Teachers could not be trusted to discriminate, nor to exercise moderation. Tendency with corporal punishment is to extend its use for trivial offenses. Principal should not be obliged to be whipping master, if duty is confided to him, and not permitted to teachers. If permitted to principal, difficult to prevent teachers.
4. Corporal punishment has not been permitted in Borough of Manhattan during my experience, all of which has been in that Borough.
5. Yes. But the knowledge of some other deterrent would be fully as effective. When parents refuse to co-operate with the schools or only do so indifferently, some pupils are very difficult to handle. The average child,

like the average adult, likes to get the better of another. I think this is almost a fundamental trait. Authority, to be respected, must be backed up. Occasionally, persons are of such high character, have so much force, that they require no external support, and it is difficult for them to realize that others do require this support. The average person of good character and purpose does. Teachers in the mass certainly do, and principals as well. Society is organized on this theory. At present, this support does not exist.

6. The present Compulsory Education Law should be amended so as to be enforceable, or the Board of Education should be represented by counsel when cases of truancy and incorrigibility are brought up before the courts. The parole system is excellent, if enforced, but it cannot be enforced or rather is not. The whole process is too cumbersome and lengthy. Very little support is to be had from the judges. Requests for extension of parole are usually ignored. If Section 9 (see page 94, lines 12, 13, 14 of the By-Laws, Charter Provisions) were enforced or could be enforced, most of the difficulty would be solved. By giving the truant officer power to arrest in such cases, the difficulty of enforcement might be overcome.

V. E. KILPATRICK, Acting Principal P. S. 52, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. The discipline which is secured by corporal punishment is a wretched substitute for that obtained by a rational use of the natural human incentives. Corporal punishment is bad, not because it is brutal, but because it does not correct.

4. Discipline is not what it should be in the schools, not because *corporal punishment* does not obtain, but because of a failure on the part of many teachers to utilize the great laws that have always prevailed wherever the human race has progressed.

5. I certainly believe that it is a most unfortunate thing for our schools that any child should feel he may commit any act of disorder without the possibility of receiving any forceful or adequate punishment. This seems to be the case now in New York City. For example, a boy in New York might tear up his books before his teacher's eyes, and as the rules now stand the teacher is practically helpless to correct him. But this does not call for the whipping post. It has long ago been demonstrated that the whipping post is ineffective. The need of the present is for a much more effective means of control than whipping. An ultimate means should be provided so that the teacher may maintain his authority to the fullest degree.

6. The great means of disciplining children in schools are positive, not negative. They may be broadly stated as follows:

- (a) The school organization.
- (b) The co-operation of parents.
- (c) The attitude of teachers.

When these elementary sources are fully developed there will very little, if any, difficulty with discipline occur. However, under any conditions some cases of incorrigibility are liable to arise. When they do appear, the law should provide an ultimate and sure remedy. Means should be at hand whereby the parent or guardian may be severely fined or punished. In cases where this proves unavailing, the child should be placed in a corrective institution.

MARGARET M. SLATTERY, Principal P. S. 53, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. No reason, except that my experience heretofore has been in a girls' school where corporal punishment is certainly never needed.
4. No knowledge of previous conditions.
5. Yes, where there are vicious and unruly children.
6. I can think of no other form of punishment that could be used in our schools except a loss of the noon hour or detention after school until a later time than the present By-Laws permit, which is 3.30 p. m. only.

MARGARETTA UIHLEIN, Principal P. S. 54, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.
2. Corporal punishment could never accomplish what moral suasion has done. Children should be governed by love, not fear.
4. Corporal punishment had been abolished before I became a teacher.
5. No.

LAURA CHARLTON, Principal P. S. 54, P., Manhattan:

1. No.
2. I am positive that the introduction of corporal punishment would lower the tone of a school. The principal means by which we train the children to right behavior for right's sake is the holding up of a high ideal. The school atmosphere counts for much. We must not come down to the low standard of the low-bred—we must endeavor to lift them up to ours. The incorrigible should be removed, both for his own sake and for the sake of the others who are injured by his presence.
4. I do not remember a time when corporal punishment existed in New York.
5. Not among the great body of school children. But there are exceptional cases. I have had instances in my own school where, after a whipping on the part of the father of the boy, great improvement has been seen. In every case, it has been a boy who was guilty of insolence toward his teacher before the class. And these have not been boys who came from homes where poverty existed.

6. I firmly believe that removal from the school to a reformatory school or school for delinquents for a stated period would be productive of good results. The worst boy is sensitive to public opinion, especially on the part of the majority of his fellow-pupils or street companions. But the insolent boy is often reformed by a thrashing.

EDGAR VANDERBILT, Principal P. S. 55, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. The abuses from its use, or, rather, the ill effects of its use are greater than the benefits gained. My judgment is formed from my observation as a *pupil* in Public School 32 and Public School 11 before its abolition, viz., in years 1856, '57, '58, '59 and '60 (Principals Geo. W. Cooper and John G. McNary), and as a teacher in Public School 55, when corporal punishment was inflicted only by the principal under restrictions, by Principals Lemuel H. Waters and Wm. M. Baker, 1867-1869.

4. I believe that the discipline is equally good since the abolition of corporal punishment as before.

5. I do not.

6. I believe that a principal's power to protect his pupils from wayward and vicious comrades is inadequate at present because of lax enforcement of laws upon derelict parents of truants, and want of accommodation in truant schools or parental schools.

An adequate number of such schools or classes should be provided for truants and for other incorrigibles, to care for them for a sufficient length of time to enable them to form habits of regular attendance, of respect for the rights of others, and of attention to duty.

ALICE V. PARLE Principal P. S. 56, Manhattan (girls only):

1. Yes.

2. There are some boys, a small minority, fortunately, who are defiant, insolent or wilfully unruly. These faults merit corporal punishment wisely administered. The boys are not defective, either mentally or physically, but, knowing the limited power of teacher and principal, take advantage of such knowledge.

3. Power to inflict corporal punishment should be in the hands of the principal, but the parent ought to be given the opportunity to chastise the culprit, the principal acting only where parents fail to effect an improvement.

4. Corporal punishment had been abolished when I entered the system. But the Child Labor Law has forced into school a class of children that formerly did not attend school regularly, if at all, and whose names were dropped from the rolls. Of course, we all agree that these boys should attend school.

5. Yes, and I believe the knowledge that such punishment could be inflicted would act as a deterrent; only in very rare cases would it be necessary to punish.

ELIZABETH A. DUGGAN, Principal P. S. 57, Manhattan:

I am instructed by the principal, Miss E. A. Duggan, who is absent owing to illness, to state that she does not favor corporal punishment.

LOTTIE M. MARR,
Asst. to Prin.

W. F. O'CALLAGHAN, Principal P. S. 58, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. I do believe it does not produce the effects required. I never whip my own children.
4. I can't say.
5. Yes; if punishment could be applied, I would not apply it.
6. Patience, love and spirit of fairness on the part of teachers and principal.

MARY C. MCGUIRE, Principal P. S. 59, Manhattan:

1. Yes.
3. Really, punishment to the body. Give the power to administer it to the principal only.
4. I was not in the system when corporal punishment was abolished.
5. Yes.

JOHN S. ROBERTS, Principal P. S. 62, Gr., Manhattan:

1. No.
2. (a) It gives rise to very sharp and bitter antagonism between scholars and parents on the one hand, and school officials on the other.
(b) It introduces an undesirable tone and atmosphere into the school.
(c) It is very likely to be abused, especially where the cause of the disorder is a physical defect.
4. I was not principal when corporal punishment was permitted.
5. It probably does in a few special cases of insubordination.
6. The principal of a school should be given more power to deal with the cases that occur in his own school.

HARRIET V. R. FIELD, Principal P. S. 62, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.
2. I consider it too brutal. The pupils would fear the principal or teacher but would not have any greater respect for them or for law and order. The

power to inflict corporal punishment should not be placed in the hands of the teachers for they might act too hastily. I think the principal's time could be better employed. I wish the confidence, not the fear, of my pupils. The child who gives the most trouble at school, as a rule, does so at home and probably is frequently whipped, yet without deterring him from wrongdoing.

4. That I cannot say, for I have never attended a school, as pupil, teacher or principal, where corporal punishment was employed.

5. Not with the girls. As I have had no experience with boys, I am hardly in a position to judge. I believe, however, that the pupils know too much of the limitations to the power of those instructing them. I have been told that boys sometimes speak very frankly of the limited means the teachers have to punish them.

6. I believe that some other form of punishment should be devised, but as my experience has been entirely with girls, it is more difficult to make suggestions.

I think the establishment of schools similar to Public School 120 would be an excellent idea. I have been told that conditions in the boys' schools in this district have improved since the organization of that school.

HELENA A. HULSKAMP, Principal P. S. 63 Manhattan, (girls only):

1. Yes.

2. It is better for a boy (corporal punishment should never be administered to girls) found to be "incurable" to be kept, when possible, with normally well-behaved boys than to be placed in an institution with children of a still lower moral grade.

3. In large schools, a special class should be formed of very troublesome and incorrigible pupils, placed in charge of a teacher of exceptional disciplinary and teaching ability, with power to administer corporal punishment, a record being kept of each case, with *cause* and *to what extent* used. In smaller schools corporal punishment should be in the hands of the principal, with record kept as above. No child is to be placed in such a class except as a last resort, each teacher being made to feel that to have a pupil placed in such a class is an acknowledgment that the boy is beyond his or her control. There might be one class for two or more schools, with district superintendent having power to place boys in such class.

4. I have never been in a school where corporal punishment was used. There are incorrigibles now in school, due to the rigid enforcement of the attendance law and to the *hard and fast district lines for each school*, that some years ago were not at school but roamed the streets. Such children should not be permitted to associate daily with the average boy. He does him great harm and also wastes the time of the other scholars and the teacher.

5. I do; in the few cases, where it is needed, it causes defiant disobedience and disregard of law and order and therefore contaminates the average boy in the same class. What *one may do*, all may do.

6. Answered in No. 3.

WM. J. GOLDEY, Principal P. S. 64, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. It is an appeal to the ugly temper of the boy and leads to brutality by the principal. During my experience of over sixty years in the schools of Manhattan Borough, I have tried every method proposed by trustees or by Boards of Education and found none so successful and satisfactory as kindness to boys and sustaining the teacher's authority.

4. Better.

5. I do not.

6. My only suggestion is kindness to scholars and upholding the teacher's authority.

JOHN E. WADE, Principal P. S. 65, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. There are in every school some boys, absolutely normal physically and mentally, who, knowing that the teacher has no real power to enforce his orders, deliberately oppose their individual inclinations to the will of the teacher and of the class, creating in many cases a state of insubordination. These boys are not the neurotic, the underfed, nor the abnormal. They need no physician. What they do need is the realization that what the teacher wants is above what they want, and that physical force may be used if necessary.

3. I am unalterably opposed to that form of corporal punishment, legally defined as assault and battery, that is, the intentional striking of a boy in any way whatever. I do not want the right to strike or to whip or in any way to inflict physical pain by assault, but I do want the right to use as much physical force as may be necessary in certain cases, *e. g.*, in ejecting a boy from a room when he refuses to go, in cases of emergency as in fire drills, etc.

4. I have had no opportunity to observe discipline in the days when corporal punishment was administered, but it is my opinion that a spirit of indifference to authority is growing up in the schools.

5. I believe that the knowledge, so widely disseminated, that, however far a boy may go in his insubordination, he is immune to all consequences save the disapprobation of his teacher, is the most powerful factor in producing those conditions of disrespect which are patent to every teacher, especially when boys read in the newspapers of teachers being punished for using corporal punishment and when "yellow journals," with a fine disregard for the exemption granted to teachers by the penal code of the State, offer rewards to those convicting teachers of assault.

I believe that if the unruly boy knew that the teacher could use physical force the right would seldom have to be exercised.

6. I do not believe that any other form of punishment is available to take the place of physical force in the cases which I have cited as calling for its use, namely, defiant disobedience of commands of school authorities.

EDWARD J. McNALLY, Principal P. S. 67, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. In each school there are a few boys who fail to be fully controlled by the present authorized system of punishment. As these pupils are *only a few*, it is not necessary to declare *generally* for corporal punishment.

4. From the time that I entered the public schools as a pupil until the present time, the quality of the discipline has remained practically unchanged.

5. I believe that the knowledge on the part of a *very limited number* of pupils that no punishment *beyond that now authorized* can be inflicted, interferes with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the schools.

6. I believe that in the case of pupils who are clearly and persistently in-subordinate to the authority of the principal there should be vested in the principal the power to commit such pupils to some educational building especially designated by the Board of Education for that purpose. The offender would thus be removed from the school where he had shown bad example. In the case of corporal punishment, on the other hand, the offender would remain in the school where he had shown bad example. For a second offense, he would again receive corporal punishment, and so on for a third, fourth, fifth offense. If he were a very hardened boy, nothing but punishment so severe as to border almost on brutality would cause him to appear subdued.

IDA IKELHEIMER, Principal P. S. 68, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. I do not favor whipping or flogging.

2. The child who would be, most likely, whipped in school probably receives more than his share of beating outside of the school. It, therefore, has no deterrent effect. It does not raise the standard of the teacher's position or of her influence.

4. As I attended the schools of the present Borough of Manhattan, and have always taught in that Borough, I know nothing of the discipline in the schools before the abolition of corporal punishment. I think the discipline in the schools is no worse than it was when I began to teach twenty-two years ago. There is less respect for law and the lawful authorities out of school, so we see some effect of this in the school.

5. The knowledge on the part of the pupils that the teacher is forbidden by By-Law to use any means of correction interferes with that teacher's authority and limits her power. In this way the prohibition interferes with the proper maintenance of order and respect.

6. The stricter enforcement of the compulsory education laws. Making the parent responsible for the conduct of his child by the infliction of small fines upon the parent for the flagrant disorder and defiance of authority upon the part of the child. Some means of confining the child who has been disrespectful and defiant, that is, keeping him apart from his fellows. This for a very short period, varying from half an hour to one day, but not in reformatories or with companionship.

Much of the trouble with discipline in school is simply a reflection of the feeling against constituted authority by the adult members of the family.

JULIET PEARSON, Principal P. S. 68, P., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. If children were whipped in school it might result in a second whipping at home. With some children it would tend to make them sullen and the whipping would not have the desired effect. Sometimes a whipping results in bodily harm. We should try to win the friendship and confidence of a child, not lose it.

4. I see no difference.

6. If a fine were imposed upon the parents who do not ably support the teachers in order to produce a reform, it might have some effect.

THOMAS J. BOYLE, Principal P. S. 69, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. (a) I would not care to use it.

(b) Teachers would be less patient and corporal punishment would become general not only for major but for minor disorder.

(c) In many cases it would not improve the pupil.

(d) In cases where pupil would be improved the parent could administer the punishment.

(e) Numerous legal proceedings would result.

4. During the twenty years I have taught in Manhattan corporal punishment was prohibited. I cannot draw a comparison.

5. Yes, I think the less publicity given to these matters the better. Children very quickly learn the extent to which teachers may go. I have known boys to dare the teacher to strike them.

6. (a) That a principal should be allowed to degrade pupils without the necessity of reporting the fact to the district superintendent. Degrading is a strong factor in discipline and in my experience many boys and girls have been made better by the disgrace of degrading. It appeals to pupil's self-respect.

(b) When a pupil, after proper investigation, is suspended from a school he should, under no condition, be allowed to return to the same school, but should be sent on trial to some other school.

- (c) By-Laws of the Board might be changed to permit of detentions until 4 or 4.30 P. M. at discretion of principal.
- (d) Parents should be compelled to administer corporal punishment in the presence of the principal when necessary. The parents are responsible for most of the disorder either by neglecting children or pampering them.
- (e) Suspension from school.
- (f) Commitment to truant school or institution.

GEO. WHITE, Principal P. S. 70, Manhattan:

- 1. No.
- 2. (a) Demoralizing and useless.
- (b) Return to barbarisms long since discontinued.
- (c) Too many opportunities for suits at law, to be settled out of court by money demands.
- (d) Shield for teachers who are poor disciplinarians, whereby the pupil is nagged into acts of disobedience which could be avoided by proper management.
- (e) Whippings remembered by pupils in after years with feelings of resentment, especially if unjustly inflicted.
- (f) Substitutes force for kindness and chastisement for sympathetic feeling.
- 3. When principal in 1874 and 1904 I opposed "corporal punishment" and favored "moral suasion." In 1874 I proposed a compromise on this subject, viz.: "That principals who desired to use it should have the privilege by application to the City Superintendent or the proper Committee; but that it should not be forced on those opposed to its restoration."
- 4. Better, on the whole.
- 5. No.
- 6. I do not believe that incorrigible, immoral pupils should be retained in classes with the good, but that reform schools should be established in sections of the city to accommodate them. I think principals are deterred from using suspensions of pupils on account of the difficulties attendant on same.

U. D. SECORD, Principal P. S. 71, Manhattan:

- 1. No.
- 2. In my experience I haven't found it necessary.
- 4. Since I have been in charge of a school corporal punishment has never been allowed.

HELEN M. FANNING, Principal P. S. 72, Gr., Manhattan (girls only):

- 1. Yes.
- 2. I believe there would be a greater respect for authority, and consequently better citizens, if corporal punishment of some kind were used.

3. I prefer the rod. I think that under proper restrictions, in extreme cases only, the principal should have the power to inflict corporal punishment, particularly in a school of boys.

4. As corporal punishment has never been used in this school, I cannot make any comparison.

5. Yes.

SARAH SMITH, Principal P. S. 72, P., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. I think it would take away the refining influence which prevails in our schools to-day.

4. Better. The timid child will attend school regularly knowing that no whipping is done.

5. I believe it does to some extent in schools where there are incorrigible pupils.

6. Pupils who cannot be controlled without corporal punishment should be placed in a school provided for such children. They should not be allowed to attend our public schools, as their influence is bad.

MARY C. BERGEN, Principal P. S. 73, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. I fear its abuse. I do not consider it a "cure-all."

4. I have had no experience with its use.

5. Not as a rule. Perhaps in extraordinary cases it might be true.

JOHN WALSH, Principal P. S. 74, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes, if the method of suspension now in use is continued.

2. When the parents of a pupil have any control over him, and exercise their authority judiciously, resort to corporal punishment is rarely necessary, but there are boys who neither respect nor fear their parents, and to prevent these lads from becoming "undesirable citizens," moral suasion will not suffice. This is particularly true in the case of boys whose widowed mothers are slaving to give their sons an education. Many of these lads disobey their mothers, become truants, associate with bad companions, and develop into criminals despite the efforts of mother, teacher and attendance officer.

3. A strap or a rattan should be used in inflicting punishment, and it should be administered by the principal of the school or a teacher selected by him after the offense has been carefully investigated.

4. I believe that the discipline is worse since corporal punishment has been prohibited. While it was in use there were very few truants, notwithstanding there was no attendance officer or truant school.

5. There is no doubt that the knowledge on the part of the pupils that no corporal punishment can be inflicted by the principal encourages disobedient and disorderly pupils to be insolent and defiant to their teachers. An incorrigible pupil having been told by his teacher "I will report your conduct to the principal," replied, "What do I care for the principal. He can't do anything to me."

JOANNA J. HILL, Principal P. S. 74, P., Manhattan:

The undersigned respectfully asks to be excused from giving any replies, or expressing any opinions or suggestions on the subject matter contained in these questions.

She begs to say that while she appreciates the privilege of answering the Committee whose labors testify their interest in the welfare of the schools, she does not feel justified in stating her views on a question concerning which different conditions and environment must necessarily produce different and conflicting opinions and statements.

FREDERICK A. BERGHANE, Principal P. S. 75, Manhattan:

1. For a limited few—Yes.
2. (a) Lack of parental control and co-operation.
(b) Knowledge of corporal punishment By-Law.
(c) Magistrates, as a rule, will not punish or fine offenders.
(d) Lack of respect for school authority.
3. The kind that pains but does not injure. Some one to be delegated to administer the same in the presence of the parent, or, better yet, have the parent administer it, after thorough investigation.
4. There has been no corporal punishment since I entered the school system, and therefore I can make no comparison.
5. With wilfully troublesome boys I believe it does.
6. If any other form of punishment would have the desired result, I should certainly prefer it to corporal punishment. Teachers should not have the power to punish.

If the city magistrates would fine the parents, or if this power were delegated to the district superintendent, it would be a step in the right direction.

MARY A. MAGOVERN, Principal P. S. 76, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. Corporal punishment would be beneficial in comparatively few cases, those offenses, mainly, which constitute open disrespect or deliberate defiance of the authority of the teacher. To make the punishment effective, it would have to be administered by the teacher at the moment the offense is committed, and witnessed by the pupils who witnessed the offense. This would

militate against the general good feeling of the class, and involve a greater strain upon the teacher than the use of prevailing methods of discipline.

4. Better.

5. Yes.

It is suggested that this feeling could be removed by the following means:

- (a) The suppression of all newspaper mention of trials of teachers for violation of the By-Law referring to corporal punishment.
- (b) Placing the power to try teachers charged with such violation in the hands of district superintendent, because of his closer acquaintance with the condition and general tone of the school and the neighborhood.
- (c) Excusing, without detriment to record, such violation when the teacher can prove that the circumstances demanded an immediate display of superior physical power.

6. Special provision should be made for the education, in separate schools, of children who are not amenable to ordinary methods of discipline. This segregation, united with a determined demand by school officials for the infliction of penalties provided for by the Compulsory Education Law, would undoubtedly induce in parents a stronger sense of their responsibility for the conduct of their children, higher respect for law and authority, and a keener realization of the advantages which their children enjoy.

EDWARD A. PAGE, Principal P. S. 77, B., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. I answer no because I feel that an unrestricted use of corporal punishment would be worse than its prohibition. Its use under restrictions deserves careful consideration.

5. Yes, and I further believe that all public statements by officials of the limited authority of both principals and teachers are extremely detrimental to the maintenance of discipline.

MATILDA B. LEMLEIN, Principal P. S. 77, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. Not in girls' schools.

2. Girls can be reached and influenced by other means.

4. I cannot answer.

5. Unruly pupils often take advantage of the fact that practically there are no means of punishing them.

WM. L. BULKLEY, Principal P. S. 80, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. An ideal government is one where love is supreme and fear plays an unimportant part. To such an ideal we are striving in our school; but we are hindered in reaching that goal by the occasional child who comes from

home conditions far from ideal. A child of this sort is irresponsible to appeals to honor and duty, and fears oftentimes only one thing—physical pain. To place such a child in a schoolroom where he has nothing to fear is not only to fail to help him, but also to give him an opportunity to harm others. If, however, he enters into our school life with a fear of punishment which he knows we have the right to inflict, we could, as we have many times done, bring him gradually to a consciousness of right and wrong, a respect for self, and a regard for the rights of others. At that moment the rod is not only unnecessary and undesirable, but may prove vicious.

3. (a) The form:—Of all the different forms not likely to produce serious injury, I prefer, in the case of a boy, a spanking or blows upon the hand with a strap; in case of a girl, the latter.

(b) Conditions:—In private; possibly by the principal, head of department, or class teacher, as would be deemed best by the principal; and at the most convenient time.

4. As I came to New York after the abolition of corporal punishment, I am not able to make the comparison.

5. Yes; on the part of that class of boys and girls previously referred to.

6. I am opposed to corporal punishment administered thoughtlessly. It should be given, like a drastic, only in cases of actual necessity; but, like such a dose, there are times when it should be given.

Even when I taught where the rod was not in disfavor, I rarely used it. I should find infrequent occasion to use it in *this* school; but I believe that, if I had been permitted to give physical pain, I could have saved from the streets boys whom I failed to reach through higher motives.

I should like to see the 3.30 limit of detention removed.

I think a little more freedom could profitably be allowed the principal to reduce a pupil to a lower grade or to prevent his promotion, where, in his judgment, it would favorably affect the conduct of said pupil.

HENRY J. HEIDENIS, Principal, P. S. 82, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. Because it is the natural remedy (a smart slap is even given by physicians immediately after birth to save life).

Because it re-establishes the equilibrium, at once, which outrageous conduct destroys.

Because it saves time and money for parents and the State, doing away with long interviews with parents.

3. Use of a good thin rattan which will carry conviction, without injuring the hand or the back. The best person to administer the *treatment* is the Board of Health physician, or the janitor or one of his assistants. This person would be impartial. It is undignified for a principal, or a judge in a court, to administer direct punishment.

4. During the thirty-one years that I am connected with the public schools in New York, it was abolished, and I cannot answer.

5. Yes. The school of which I was principal in 1875 had corporal punishment. No child even dared to *look* insolently at his teacher, as he knew what would *turn up*.

6. Of the 2,000 children in Public School 82 about eight or ten make trouble, so I get along very well without corporal punishment, and the parents, when sent for, apply the *natural* remedy for me to the president's taste.

JOSEPH J. CASEY, Principal P. S. 83, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes, in a degree; only as to boys.

2. Of late years it is a matter of comment that children are losing respect for elders. It is not uncommon to hear of young lads striking their mothers; remaining on the streets hours after nightfall; frequenting the theatre or the nickel-show without scruples as to whence the money came; with indifferent, unnatural fathers; ill-bred, ill-kept, subject to every evil influence of the streets. They know no restraint outside of the school building; they will not submit to restraint inside the classroom. The influence of evil is more powerful than the influence of good; and while the evil pupil may not corrupt every other pupil in the classroom, he negatives the work of the teacher, and his presence is baneful. The little respect that he shows his parents is emphasized in the treatment of his teachers. With such cases "moral suasion" is lethargic. It needs physical pain to awaken the dulled conscience.

3. A long, thin rattan, applied to the thighs, calves, or bottom, and only after several warnings from teacher and principal. The corporal punishment should never be inflicted by a teacher under any circumstances, but by the principal. A punishment should never be passed over.

4. Worse.

5. Decidedly. There is scarce a boy in the school who does not know that the teacher is not allowed to strike the pupil. This knowledge has much to do with the unruly acts of the children. I am not anxious to wield the rod myself. Long ago it was said by a famous policeman that it was the knowledge of the power to use the club, rather than the use itself of the club, that kept the disorderly element in restraint. The club is not abolished because there is an occasional brute on the police force. So, if there were a rod in my desk and the boys knew it would be used when necessary, that fact alone would minimize its use.

6. I am not so much in favor of corporal punishment that I should not waive it for something else. At present the By-Laws are of little help. They need reconstruction. If a pupil is amenable under paragraph 3, Section 48 of the By-Laws, the principal cannot suspend except with the approval of the district superintendent, a hearing or trial, and the final judgment of the City Superintendent. All these steps take time. One case in my own school took nearly four months. If the pupil is actually suspended under paragraph 4 of the same section, there is again the routine to be followed as in the previous paragraph, with this difference, that the boy is on the streets from the time of his suspension until the final judgment of the City Superintendent.

Permit me to suggest as follows: If the principal is the administrative head of his school, let him be so in fact as well as in name. Give him absolute power of suspension; the first to a neighboring school; the second, suspension, after a two weeks' trial, to a reform school. Give the principal power to compel the co-operation of the parties in parental relation to the child, in case there is a disposition to shift responsibility on the school for the child's conduct, by citing them before a magistrate's court. As a last resort, the suspension from the school. But on whomever the punishment, let it fall promptly and before the offense may be forgotten.

C. AUGUSTA SANGER, Principal P. S. 83, P., Manhattan:

1. Yes.
2. As some pupils cannot be governed by moral suasion, more severe measures should be used to teach these pupils obedience to, and respect for, school laws.

The boys who need corporal punishment take more than their share of the attention of the teacher, thereby wasting the time of pupils who attend school for the purpose of study.

3. The rod, to be used by the principal in cases of insubordination and extreme disobedience.

4. As corporal punishment was abolished previous to my appointment as a teacher, I am not in a position to judge.

5. I most decidedly believe that this knowledge on the part of pupils engenders a spirit of defiance to school discipline. If the pupils knew that corporal punishment could be administered there would be very little necessity for inflicting it.

6. Although not opposed to corporal punishment, I would suggest that the principal be given more power in the matter of the suspension of pupils.

SUSAN M. MACK, Principal P. S. 84, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. The law looks upon the school as a place for the acquirement of knowledge, not for punishment, corporal.
4. In my experience, the conditions have improved since the abolition of corporal punishment.

5. No.

6. If the Board of Education require, in addition to the standard of intellectual attainments for promotion, that the pupil shall have conducted himself satisfactorily, I think that would have a deterrent effect on the pupil.

MARY H. DONOHUE, Principal P. S. 85, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. When necessary, the parents, or those standing in this relation to children, are the ones who should inflict such punishment. They should be

compelled to see to it that their children attend school regularly and punctually, and that the conduct of said children when in school is satisfactory.

A school being a place of instruction should not take the place of a reformatory.

4. There has been no corporal punishment in the schools since my connection with the system, therefore, am unable to express an opinion on this point.

5. Yes. I do believe that this knowledge has a bad effect upon the lawless and daring. There is entirely too little respect for law, order, authority or age.

Entirely too much publicity is given in public print to any infringement on the part of the teacher of the rules governing this matter. All such matters should be kept strictly within the confines of the Board of Education. Such publicity and the consequent comments are disastrous to the children and the schools.

6. The punishment of the parents by fines when their carelessness or neglect is proven, and the strict enforcement of the law imposing said fines.

A full and free use of the power of *suspension*, when dealing with incorrigible pupils, with quick and decisive action.

The magistrates should compel the parents, when brought before them, to comply with the laws. This is specially true regarding *truancy* and *absentee* cases. Many of these irregular pupils are the unruly ones, because in many cases they must attend school, not only against their own wishes, but those, also, of their parents. This is also the cause of much of the trouble with "over-age" children.

It should not be all punishment. There should be a much wider latitude and greater freedom in the granting of rewards. Children as well as others appreciate a tangible reward as the result of their efforts toward well-doing.

JOHN J. O'REILLY, Principal P. S. 86, B., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. Few children are lacking in respect for authority. These few can be reached by methods which have a more lasting effect for good.

4. Decidedly better.

5. No.

6. I do not see any necessity for a change from present methods.

ADA A. BRENNAN, Principal P. S. 86, P., Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. Some offences committed by boys in class rooms should be summarily dealt with by corporal punishment, otherwise demoralizing effects are far-reaching. Efficient children also have their rights and injustice is done them when extremely disorderly boys are allowed to absorb more than a fair share of the teachers' time, energy and attention, as at present.

3. It should never be administered by the teachers; the janitor might, under the principal's direction, give a certain number of blows on the hands, etc.

4. I was not connected with the schools before the abolition of corporal punishment in Manhattan.

5. Decidedly. The knowledge that it *could* be administered would do away with the necessity of using it in many cases.

EDW. H. BOYER, Principal P. S. 87, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. Corporal punishment for school offenses brutalizes pupils, degrades the teacher and destroys the true relation which should subsist between teacher and pupils, to wit, companionship with leadership on the part of the teacher.

4. Far better now than ever before.

5. No.

6. If teachers are capable of discharging their duties properly, they will establish such relations with their pupils that the necessity for controlling *actions* by various forms of punishment will be obviated by the control which such a teacher exercises over *motives*.

SUSIE A. GRIFFIN, Principal P. S. 88, Manhattan:

1. The power to use it—yes.

2. When properly administered it is less cruel, less degrading and less injurious to the child's character than confinement in a truant school or a trial by the Children's Court.

3. For one offense only; namely, insubordination, and then only as a last resource. I would have it administered in the school by the parent if possible; if not, by the teacher or principal whose authority has been resisted, after permission had been obtained from the district superintendent.

4. I was not in the system when corporal punishment was allowed.

5. Most decidedly so. If children felt that corporal punishment could be inflicted when necessary there would be very little need of it. It seems to me that the solution of the whole problem lies in amending the By-Laws in such a manner as to make corporal punishment *possible but not practicable*. If the By-Law were amended to read as follows: "No corporal punishment shall be inflicted in any of the public schools except by permission of the district superintendent," teachers and principals would apparently have the *power* while in reality they could rarely, if ever, avail themselves of it. The moral effect of its use would thus be gained, while the evil results attendant upon an abuse of it would be absolutely impossible.

As corporal punishment should be resorted to only after all other means have failed, I believe that detention of pupils after 3.30 P. M. should be per-

mitted, and that the good ticket and early dismissal on Friday afternoon for the well-behaved children should be restored.

For the punishment and prevention of wrong-doing the State has its fines and its prisons, the Army and Navy have their cells and guardhouses, but under present conditions the schools have neither rewards to offer nor punishments to inflict. We are demanding of the children "right actions because they are right"—a degree of moral excellence rarely met with in adults and surely impossible in childhood.

THOMAS C. HALLIGAN, Principal P. S. 89, B., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. The infliction of corporal punishment could not with safety be entrusted to the indiscriminate or capricious use of the teachers, and to restrict the exercise of this form of punishment to the principal alone would degrade him in the estimation of the pupils and hence lessen his influence in the school. Moreover, the administering of corporal punishment by the principal would put a premium on poor teaching by encouraging some teachers to rely upon the rod in the principal's office rather than upon the excellence of their own teaching to secure and maintain the proper sort of discipline in their classes. Teaching and discipline are really a single process.

4. I cannot say from my own experience. Corporal punishment has not been permitted at any time during my employment in the schools.

5. I believe that the knowledge on the part of the pupils that we have no adequate and effective means to restrain or to reform bad boys does interfere with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the schools. In the constant struggle with what may be termed the lawless element of the school community (the 2%, or less) the time and energy of both principal and teachers are largely dissipated, and the 98%, representing the good citizenship of the school, suffer accordingly. A knowledge that corporal punishment could be inflicted would probably have some good effect on this lawless element, but other and more efficient remedies could be applied; and some of these I recommend in my answer to the next question.

6. (a) The period for detention after school should be extended to 4 o'clock.

The half hour now permitted is entirely inadequate to make any impression on the pupils.

(b) Principals should be empowered to summon parents to the school in cases of incorrigibility of pupils, and suitable blank forms provided for the purpose.

(c) Pupils suspended by the principal and found guilty of the charges by the district superintendent should be committed to the truant or parental school, and not merely transferred to another public school. The suspension by the principal comes only after repeated offenses, and the pupil suspended is really an old offender. Suspension has but little deterrent effect, when it means simply a transfer to another school.

- (d) Justices of the Children's Court should be prevailed upon not to dismiss from court and turn loose into the schools (*i. e.*, "parole") children who have been guilty of committing crime.
- (e) Parents should be held by the courts to a more strict account for the waywardness of their children.

TERESA L. ATKINSON, Principal P. S. 89, P., Manhattan:

- 1. No.
- 2. The abuse of it, if in the hands of teachers. Also the increase of complaint on their part, if the power to punish was in the hands of the principal.
- 4. I have no information on this point.
- 5. Decidedly so. The parents of some are at fault more than the children. The spirit of bravado is probably encouraged at home. As a rule, the parents who cannot control are opposed to any form of punishment in school. They encourage insubordination, and enjoy the humiliation of teachers.
- 6. (a) Increasing the time of detention until four o'clock P. M.
(b) A parental school that will accommodate the worst offenders.
(c) Some legislative enactment which would impose punishment on the parents of wayward pupils.
(d) Teachers who like to teach boys.

JENNIE BERMINGHAM, Principal P. S. 90, Manhattan:

- 1. No.
- 2. All children resent this and hatred of teacher and school result. The school should be a place that children love and not fear.
- 4. In my experience as teacher and principal corporal punishment has not been permitted. If corporal punishment were permitted, I would not use it in a school under my supervision.
- 5. It may in some few cases where brute discipline is used in the home, but I have not in my experience found a case that could not be managed through love and interest in the child. A child won by this means grows to respect himself, his teacher and his school.
- 6. I think the principal of a school should be permitted to devise certain forms of punishment; detaining after school hours to pay back lost time during the day; depriving of certain privileges permitted to other children and in extreme cases, suspension.

ANNIE E. BOYNE, Principal P. S. 92, Manhattan:

- 1. No.
- 2. It would destroy the dignity and self-control that a teacher should possess under all circumstances.
- 4. No corporal punishment has been allowed by the Board of Education since my appointment.

5. The pupils do realize the limit of authority on part of teacher and principal.

6. A co-operation of home and school and a greater responsibility than now exists placed on the parents.

(a) The parents to be fined for continued disobedience on part of pupil.

(b) The parent to be made to come to school and inflict corporal punishment in the presence of the principal.

EMMA S. LANDRINE, Principal P. S. 93, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. It would seem to me a step backward, and so a great pity. My opinion is probably worthless, as I am principal of a girls' school; but I taught boys for ten years in schools where corporal punishment was permitted. It impressed me as a great mistake.

5. I think it might with a class of children who have never acted from a higher motive than fear of bodily pain—but is it not better to implant a better motive? I have seen it done; there is some way to gain every boy.

6. I should think this might be left to a wise principal; one rule could not answer for all localities, all children, even in one school.

CORDELIA S. KILMER, Principal P. S. 94, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. There is so much indiscriminate "beating" at home of children who would need it in school that they become hardened to it, and I feel that the effect would soon be the same if administered *in* school, though I must candidly admit there are cases under my own observation, daily, where I believe that "sparing the rod is spoiling the child."

4. Having been in a girls' grammar department always previous to my appointment as principal, twelve years ago, I am not able to judge of this.

5. I do, *most* decidedly, and see it manifested daily, in the attitude assumed by pupils and frequently by parents, as well.

6. This is difficult to do, as the "punishment must be fitted to the crime" and each case of insubordination needs different treatment.

Power to keep a pupil in during the noon hour, with a simple luncheon (bread and water) eaten alone; power to detain after 3, or as late as deemed necessary, and similar punishments, have a most wholesome effect and do not result in injury to the child. Any punishment should be with knowledge of the principal, and parents should be duly notified.

Rewards to excellent pupils often have a stimulating effect upon troublesome ones.

The dismissing of *very* meritorious pupils or those making a *great* improvement for the week, for even a half hour earlier on Friday; the giving of the old time testimonials would be helps. Now we have absolutely nothing either as a reward or punishment. It is not *always* punishment which produces the desired effect.

ELIZA S. PELL, Principal P. S. 96, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. Discipline may be gained by corporal punishment, but it cannot be maintained by it.

Corporal punishment does not develop character nor does it make pupils self-reliant. It is a barbarous way of subduing a child. Incurrible children receive too much of this kind of treatment at home.

It is degrading to the teacher or principal who administers it.

4. Corporal punishment was abolished before I entered the "Public School system."

5. Yes, of cowards, corporal punishment would intimidate them.

6. I would suggest that a fine—let it be ever so small—be imposed upon the parents of the incorrigible child, if the child's perverseness is not due to some abnormal condition.

In an extreme case either father or mother should be compelled to whip the child in the presence of the class. Seldom would this mode of punishment have to be administered.

MARY C. O'BRIEN, Principal P. S. 96, P., Manhattan:

1. If it means use of the rod, No!

2. It is degrading to the pupil and to the teacher or principal who administers it, and if in the presence of the class, an outrage upon the good children who should not be subjected to the sight.

4. I cannot say, as my teaching experience has been only in Manhattan, where it was never permissible.

5. Yes.

6. I suggest that the parent or guardian be compelled to take the responsibility in the case of a dangerous or incorrigible pupil who defies the authority of the school. Many parents throw all responsibility upon the school.

A system of small fines, I believe, would have a good effect—the amount to be determined and collected by the principal. In the event of non-payment of fine, the pupil should be placed in a school set apart for disciplinary purposes until satisfactory evidence is given of his reformation. The money so obtained might be applied to the purchase of glasses, nutritious food, shoes or other clothing, etc., in legitimate cases of need at the discretion of the principal.

CATHERINE V. DAVIS, Principal P. S. 98, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. When obedience to authority is a free voluntary act, it has high moral value, but when it springs from a fear of corporal punishment its disciplinary effects are poor indeed. The use of the rod implants a sense of fear in children which is an improper school incentive.

4. When corporal punishment existed, I was in charge of a girls' school.

5. No.

6. Mild and natural punishments are more effective than the rod. The teachers' love for pupils, her will power, her exhibition of quiet power, ten words of praise to one of censure, all tend to good disciplinary results.

ANNA E. MASTERSON, Principal P. S. 103, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. I consider it degrading to a pupil's self-respect. Younger boys might be frightened by the possibility of it.

4. I never had any experience with the power of corporal punishment.

5. Yes, I do. There are many boys who are now rebellious and defiant who would fear corporal punishment.

6. I believe that all boys who are incorrigible should be removed from the class. In large schools, one strong teacher could receive all these pupils, and give them a trial before suspension. If wilfully disobedient and defiant in this special class such pupils should be suspended and then placed in a special school. Parents should be compelled to assume more responsibility.

CARRIE WALLACE KEARNS, Principal P. S. 105, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. (a) Few children require such punishment in school.

(b) Those few would grow sullen and resentful, if so punished.

(c) It is a lowering of our ideals.

4. I know nothing of the days when corporal punishment was permitted. The problem of the so-called bad boy will always exist, yet I am optimistic enough to believe that our schools are better than they ever were.

5. No. The hesitancy of the courts to punish parents who neglect to aid teachers in reforming truants interferes with the maintenance of order.

6. Parents should be held to a strict account and should be punished instead of the children very often. There is a growing lack of respect for parental authority, seen even in children of kindergarten age, that is ominous for our city and our nation.

MAY JACKSON, Principal P. S. 106, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. The maintenance of proper order in our schools is daily growing more difficult. The influx of foreign pupils has changed standards of behavior. First government, then training, is a sound maxim; we are now wasting time in an effort to secure government.

3. An old-fashioned "spanking." Dean Shaw used to say that this was the mother's method and so was instinctive and correct.

Administered by the teacher in the presence of the principal; a record kept of the offense and punishment.

4. Corporal punishment was abolished before I was in the schools.

5. I believe this interferes seriously; the knowledge that it could be inflicted would minimize the necessity for its infliction.

MARGARET A. REGAN, Principal P. S. 107, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. My school is small, and easily managed. I have not felt the necessity for it.

4. Not having had the opportunity to use it, I cannot answer the question.

5. Since the public schools must admit all classes of children, there certainly will be found those who will be deterred from wrong-doing by the fear of corporal punishment. A knowledge that it may be inflicted would probably assist in maintaining order and respect with that class of children.

6. Limit the size of the schools. Make it a physical possibility for the personal influence of the principal to reach every pupil in his school.

HONORA R. SWEENEY, Principal P. S. 108, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. (a) I consider a child's self-respect is injured by the infliction of a blow given by any other than a parent.

(b) The respect shown by a pupil, after such punishment, is merely a surface feeling, the result of fear.

4. Better; since its foundation is placed upon a better condition than bodily fear.

5. It is possible that such knowledge on the part of older pupils may interfere with the proper maintenance of order in school; but it is not apt to make the government of small boys any more difficult.

6. The few lawless spirits to be found in every school should be removed from companionship with obedient, rule-abiding pupils, and placed in special classes under firm, strict discipline. Allowing these unruly children to remain in regular classes is a source of annoyance and danger to well-inclined, obedient children; and to many well inclined, but weak children, who are liable to be drawn from the right path by these strong-willed, unmanageable companions.

FRANK J. COLEMAN, Principal P. S. 109, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. It rouses fear and resentment in the child. It may tend to completely crush its spirit, and make it cowardly and deceitful in its efforts to escape punishment. If the child is a spirited one, corporal punishment will rouse violence and bitterness, and cause the stolidity so common in hardened criminals.

Statistics have proven that punishment is *not* a preventive of crime; we all must feel that good and faithful *training* is the only safeguard. Then, too, the administering of corporal punishment to a child degrades the adult.

4. From my observations, I am confident that it is *better*. The child who falls in line of his own free will, because he feels that it is right, gives truer and manlier obedience than he who obeys from a sense of *fear*.

5. Not at all. "The child is father to the man." It is quick to *see* the right, and happy to *do* it, if treated with the *dignity* and *kindness* which is its sovereign right. Even many obstreperous and self-willed a child has been conquered where all else failed by the example of the *class*. Public School 109 is situated in what is conceded to be one of the worst districts of the city, the inhabitants, for the most part, being poor, uncultured foreigners with large families. There is with them no *time* for ethical training, even if there were a *desire* for it. A *blow* to the child is a *common* thing, not the *exception*. Moral suasion is to them at first a *surprise*, then a *delight*. It acts on the children like sunshine on plants; whereas a *blow* produces instantly that stolid indifference which is most painful to observe.

6. I *do* believe that for the exceptional *two* or *three* in every thousand a special treatment would be beneficial. This, both to safeguard the many tractable ones and to benefit the few who *are* morally depraved; whether this deplorable condition was due to lack of training and bad environment or to heredity. For these comparatively few cases special training schools might be instituted where *wise* men and women, aided by specialists, could give individual treatment with a view to effecting a *cure* of the evil propensities. The *morally* sick have as good a right to careful individual treatment as those who are physically and mentally unfit to walk side by side with the healthy.

KATE DEVINE, Principal P. S. 112, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. I think that in *exceptional* cases corporal punishment is more beneficial in influencing the behavior of the pupil.

4. No perceptible difference.

5. Yes.

M. F. MAGUIRE, Principal P. S. 113, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. I fear its abuse.

4. We never had corporal punishment, so I can draw no comparison.

JENNIE M. TOWER, Principal P. S. 114, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. It would be a step backward. Personally, I could never whip a child.

4. As a pupil, a teacher and a principal I never was in a school where corporal punishment was used, so I cannot make a comparison.
5. Among certain children—yes.
6. The parents should be made responsible, by making them pay for a child who will not obey, in a school where men teachers have charge.

ANNA A. McNULTY, Principal P. S. 116, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. (a) The office of whipping master is not compatible with the highest ideal of a teacher.
(b) The parent must not be relieved of his responsibility in disciplining his child.
4. There is room for improvement in the matter of discipline; the weakness is due largely, I believe, to the home influences, either parental ignorance or irresponsibility.

It is this cause that is responsible, to a large degree, for the disregard of law and order. Too often meddlesome neighbors intimidate parents in the matter of disciplining children, complain to societies, etc.

5. The knowledge that school authorities are powerless to enforce, where moral suasion fails to *win*, has been, I believe, responsible for some of the school troubles. Dr. Parkhurst, in a magazine article on "The Decadence of Authority in the Home and in the School," recognizes the good accomplished by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, but suggests a Society for the Prevention of the Overindulgence of Children. We who are deeply concerned about the moral welfare of our children and the ethical standards of *future* citizens read into the thought a very significant admission.

6. When the business of the classroom is interrupted by the persistent misconduct of one or more members, I believe the offender should be removed. The question then is, Where shall the offender be placed? If there could be a so-called "disorderly" class which would allow for the *segregation of the disturbing element*, under the care of a strong teacher of impressive personality, the recalcitrant pupil *would have an opportunity to reform* without impeding the progress of the law-abiding pupils, by appropriating more than his share of the teacher's time and attention. Continued misconduct in the "disorderly" class should be followed by enforced attendance at a disciplinary school. Provision for the segregation in a district would help, as in Public School 120, where not only abnormals but incorrigibles are cared for.

EMMA C. SCHOONMAKER, Principal P. S. 119, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.
2. I consider it utterly unnecessary.
4. Never had corporal punishment.
5. No.

TERESA C. BURKE, Principal P. S. 121, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. It is a degrading sort of punishment.
4. I do not remember that corporal punishment was ever allowed in Manhattan.
5. Yes.
6. Fine the parents of incorrigible pupils.

EUGENIE C. LEVIE, Principal P. S. 124, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. Opposed because corporal punishment administered by any one not in parental relation would antagonize child, and defeat its object by rendering some children defiant.

Another reason: Corporal punishment is so injudiciously used by some parents as a corrective for the most trifling offense, it becomes ineffective when used for more serious offenses.

4. About the same.
5. In some few cases, yes.
6. A system of rewards, such as dismissing industrious pupils at 2 o'clock on Friday, would act as a deterrent on those not rewarded.

Also allowing discretionary power in the hands of the principal to detain children in some cases later than is laid down in the By-Laws of the Board of Education.

CLARA AMERICAN, Principal P. S. 127, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. It is a relic of barbarism. I have never found any necessity for the rod, and my school is located in one of the roughest neighborhoods of the city.
4. As there has never been corporal punishment in Manhattan in my time, I cannot answer the question.
5. No.
6. Detention during the noon hour, and in extreme cases loss of lunch, I think, would be a very effective means of punishment.

IDA GREY KUBELE, Teacher in charge P. S. 129, Manhattan:

1. In classrooms—No. In principals' and superintendents' offices—Yes.
 2. Those who cannot be reached by kindness or sense of justice cannot be reached by any other means. These cases are rare. About one out of fifty boys, about one out of three or four hundred girls.
 3. Any form that will not inflict physical injury; according to age, frequency of offence and number of teachers making complaints.
- In case of incorrigible truants, a whipping by attendance officer.

4. Corporal punishment has never been permitted since the beginning of my teaching career.

5. Yes, with persistently disobedient pupils.

6. As a rule, I am *decidedly* opposed to corporal punishment, but there are *exceptions* to every rule. The answers to the five questions above are in relation to the exceptions.

An *enforced* fine for parents of persistently disobedient pupils and truants would be very effective.

ELLEN M. PHILLIPS, Principal P. S. 131, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. (a) Degrading to both teacher and pupil.

(b) Its frequent use would tend to brutalize the administrator.

(c) It shows a retrogression in the advance of education.

(d) It may lead to serious bodily injury.

(e) It tends to make the teacher less self-controlled, which has a bad influence upon pupils.

(f) It fails to accomplish its desired purpose—reformation of character.

(g) It often emphasizes by “beating in” the very fault it is desired to eradicate.

(h) Leads to cruelty. Physically and mentally deficient children are often the victims.

(i) Its use would be abused.

4. Corporal punishment was not used in any school with which I have been connected as pupil, teacher or principal, so cannot say what effect it would have upon discipline.

5. I have never found it so in my school. I have had six hundred boys, grades 1A-4A, in my school.

6. *For truancy*:—That the power of the Board be increased to admit of fining parents.

For incorrigibility:—That the powers of the Children’s Court be increased. That the court could and would make the parents responsible.

For all minor offenses the present means of discipline are adequate.

MARY SHIRES, Principal P. S. 132, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. I do not favor the introduction of corporal punishment because the power would in some cases be abused, and also because it would be a difficult matter to decide whether the administration of corporal punishment would produce the desired result to the one receiving it. It might have a value in deterring those who are ready to follow the lead of the deficient and incorrigible.

4. Corporal punishment has never been permitted during my connection with the schools.

5. Yes.

6. More power should be given to the principal. For instance, in a case of insubordination the principal should have the power to order the child out with the injunction to return with parent or guardian within a given period. A principal should be given the power to demote a child when in his or her judgment such demotion would be best for the child.

KATE M. STEPHENS, Principal P. S. 135, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. The responsibility pertaining to all violent measures in the management of children should be assumed by parents.
4. Better—because it is the result of the children's own efforts to do right.
5. No.
6. The incorrigible child should be placed in a parental school.

MARIETTA J. TIBBITS, P. S. 137, Manhattan:

1. Yes, under conditions as stated below.
2. My school is a small one where I can more easily watch and influence individual pupils, therefore I have not needed it. In large schools, where so many classes of children are to be governed, there should be absolute power in the hands of the principal to enforce prompt obedience. The rules made are for the needs of all, failure to obey endangers all; the principal must have power to punish disobedience.
3. Flogging, by the principal only, or under his direction, in the presence of the parent. This should be the last resort in disciplinary cases.
4. Worse, because no power has been given to replace it by other discipline.
5. Yes. Perhaps I would qualify that answer by saying that this is not true in the schools of the Second and Third Districts, where the principals may transfer incorrigible boys to Public School 120. The need is for the principal to have in his own power the administration of his school both in the matter of punishment and reward. We now have neither, and can only confess our weakness by an investigation which frequently puts us on trial rather than the pupil.
6. (a) The organization of more special schools such as Public School 120.
(b) The passage of a "Parents' Liability Act," and the enforcement of some penalty, such as a fine, by it. This is as futile as our truancy law unless the fine is enforced. Many parents plead lack of control. If obliged to pay for their laxity, they promptly regain their strength.

KATE A. WALSH, Principal P. S. 141, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. Corporal punishment when inflicted by a teacher or a principal tends to lessen pupil's respect for either, and if permitted in the schools, *might* be used without proper discretion.

4. I am quite sure the discipline is better.
5. In many cases, with boys, it does.
6. More power to use judgment in each case of law violation should be given to the principal, and have pupils understand that power is vested in the principal.

W. L. ETTINGER, Principal P. S. 147, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. The great majority of children need only moral suasion when under the influence of efficient teachers, proper school spirit, public opinion of their fellow pupils, and parental co-operation. I admit that some incorrigible children seem to be amenable only to the corrective influence of corporal punishment; but these cases are not many. Very many children would be absolutely injured in their character and disposition by the infliction of physical chastisement. If therefore corporal punishment as a deterrent is beneficial in some cases, on the other hand, it is harmful in others. Hence there would be need of careful discrimination in its application. Discrimination would develop among the pupils a sense of unfair treatment which would be subversive of true discipline.
4. I never had experience in supervising schools in which corporal punishment was a means of discipline.
5. Speaking from my own experience, I do not.
6. I would suggest that several schools situated in different parts of the city be set apart as correctional or probational schools, and named "Correctional School I," etc.

All incorrigible pupils should be transferred to these schools on the recommendation of the principal of the school which they attend. If a pupil so transferred conducts himself properly for a term, he could be re-transferred to the regular elementary school. If he still persists in his incorrigibility, he could be sent to the parental school or some other correctional institution.

The segregation of unruly children in separate schools would weaken the contagion of bad example, and the problem of disciplining these children could be studied intensively without menacing the efficiency of the entire system. The fact that these schools are called correctional schools would operate to secure parental co-operation.

ALICE JACKSON, Principal P. S. 150, Manhattan:

1. Yes.
2. The cosmopolitan character of the homes from which our children come, with widely diversified opinions regarding law and order, makes the proper maintenance of order a more serious problem year by year. Obedience to law is the first consideration in the school, and some means of securing it with less expenditure of nervous energy on the part of the teacher and loss of time for pupils, is absolutely necessary.

3. The form which has always seemed the most natural in the home. To be administered by the teacher in the principal's office and a record made.
4. Corporal punishment was abolished before I entered the system.
5. Most decidedly. I have known of many cases of continued defiance of law where children boasted that the teacher could do nothing.

AGNES O'BRIEN, Principal P. S. 151, Manhattan:

1. Yes.
2. The persistent disobedience and wilful mischievousness of certain pupils.
3. When a child is persistently incorrigible, that is, after all reasonable means to correct him have failed, I believe a thrashing administered, *in school*, by his *father* or *mother*, might convince him that the school is designed for some purpose other than that of annoying his teachers and companions.
4. I am not in a position to judge, as corporal punishment had been abolished before I began to teach.
5. Yes, and for that reason, if for no other, would be in favor of having the law rescinded.
6. I am not opposed to corporal punishment. (See 3.) I am in favor of placing the responsibility of training children on the parents. If parents would instil into the minds of their children "respect for authority," there would be little, if any, trouble experienced in school by the teacher. Magistrates in Children's Courts could help considerably, by fining the parents of children who persistently defy the law, both in school and out of it.

OLIVIA J. HALL, Principal P. S. 157, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. Yes, in extreme cases.
2. Some pupils are beyond their parents' control, and the teacher must train the child.
The fear of punishment is a great deterrent.
Punishments should be administered for:
 - (a) Deliberate disobedience and insolence.
 - (b) Malicious mischief.
 - (c) Persistent laziness.
3. (a) Whipping administered privately, as a last resource. Degenerates can only be ruled by discomfort.
(b) A badge of disgrace, publicly worn, for defiance.
4. Generally speaking, much worse. At home the parents are afraid of complaints from their neighbors to the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children; and the bad child screams to frighten the parent, and to excite the sympathy of the neighbors. The teacher can look for little aid from a parent who is afraid of the child.
5. Without the slightest doubt. Mothers have told me that even their girls have said to them. "If you touch me, I'll have you arrested."

6. Except in extreme cases, I do not believe in corporal punishment; I would substitute:

- (a) A serious talk.
- (b) A badge of disgrace large enough to attract attention.
- (c) Placing in a lower class for one week.
- (d) Fining the parent. This is sure to secure his co-operation.

But I do not believe in noticing the evil only. I would encourage effort by rewards, such as:

- (a) Exhibiting excellent work.
- (b) Early dismissals once a month to those who have "A" on report cards.
- (c) Good tickets, to the very little ones.
- (d) A story to be read aloud at the end of the day, once a week.
- (e) An extra game or dance in the gymnasium, or any little pleasure a teacher might devise, for not more than twenty or thirty minutes.

ADELAIDE HAIGHT, Principal P. S. 157, P., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. Have never felt the need of it in maintaining order and respect. I consider that it would be detrimental as boys that need disciplining are generally those whose parents resort to violence on the least provocation.

4. Cannot judge. Corporal punishment was abolished before I became a principal.

5. I have not found it so.

6. Incurable boys are usually truants or irregular in attendance. Parents should be fined or punished in some way by the courts for not complying with the Compulsory Education Law.

Boys sent to the Children's Court for a flagrant offense should be punished as an example to other offenders.

B. W. PURCELL, Principal P. S. 158, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. It detracts from the dignity of the teacher. The more frequently it is used, the greater the necessity for it. Its use is more than likely to develop into abuse through temper or animosity in the teacher or principal. Because of its apparently effective and immediate results teachers would be unwilling to follow slower and more rational methods.

4. I have no means of comparison as the abolition of corporal punishment was prior to my employment in the schools.

5. I do not. Pupils never give such matters a thought unless forced upon their attention through outside means. A thoughtless press magnifies instances of corporal punishment till the teacher becomes a tyrant and the pupil a martyr. One paper has printed the statement that it will employ, at its own expense, counsel to prosecute any teacher guilty of the offense.

The delay and publicity attained by placing teacher, principal and district superintendent on trial are in effect admissions of weakness on the part of authority. That these outside conditions have not worked more serious injury is a testimonial to our present state of discipline in the schools.

6. In general the present law is adequate. Principals have power to suspend for cause. Let the hearing be private and expeditious. Let the district superintendent who has intimate knowledge of the case act promptly and be the court of last resort. Let commitment to some reformative institution be speedily made. Let there be no temporizing, such as transier to another school, etc. One case carried through to a conclusion definite, certain and just would strengthen the discipline in any school.

C. S. MONFORT, Principal P. S. 159, Manhattan:

1. Yes, under certain conditions for bad boys.
2. So many of the children of the present day are *not* taught obedience at home. A bad boy might often be made over by a little wholesome discipline. The boy of the present day is lawless.
3. Administered by principal only, and in a reasonable manner.
5. Yes.

CHAS. F. HARTMAN, Principal P. S. 160, B., Manhattan:

1. Yes.
2. For that one boy who persists in going contrary to all plain English directions.
Not for poor recitations, not for lack of proper preparation, nor for stupidity, but for doing the wrong when he knows the right.
3. By the principal after due investigation.
4. In my fifty years of service in the system, I have seen the rod in and out, and in and out. I should say no worse.
5. I do, indeed. Let the opposite be known and you have a different state of affairs. I believe it. I have seen its workings to the betterment of the entire department.
6. I am not opposed to the rod, believing that it is the only "instantaner persuader."

LOTTIE A. NORCOTT, Principal P. S. 160, P., Manhattan:

1. No.
2. It is degrading to the one who administers it and to the recipient.
4. As I have had no experience in disciplining prior to the abolition of corporal punishment, I cannot answer.
5. No.
6. Suggestion: The enforcement of a law placing the responsibility for conduct of the children upon the parents.

LIZZIE F. SPAFFORD, Principal P. S. 161, Manhattan:

1. Yes.
2. Moral suasion has not proved a success for the incorrigible boy.
3. This question I cannot answer. I am opposed to brutality, which seems to be the popular idea of corporal punishment. The old-fashioned spanking applied judiciously and in time would do away with the present disorder and total lack of respect. However, I would not wish to administer it myself nor should I want my teachers to do so.
4. I have no experience as a teacher when corporal punishment was allowed.
5. Most certainly I believe it.

D. E. GADDIS, Principal P. S. 165, B., Manhattan:

1. No, but something should be done to improve the manner of the New York boy.
 2. I am opposed to corporal punishment on the ground that its use is generally degrading both to pupil and teacher; that a condition of fear is engendered by its use, which means that perhaps there is *order* but no discipline.
 4. Few of us can intelligently answer this, as it is so long since the abolition of corporal punishment.
 5. I certainly do. There is too much talk at home about what the teacher *dare* or *dare not* do.
 6. If the plans now in force were properly carried out; if, when a boy was reported for misconduct, *he* was put on trial and *not* the teacher; if the parents could know that the teacher had some authority, and if they were compelled to respect this authority, I believe that the discipline would improve.
- If the principal was strongly supported by the district superintendent when cases of incorrigibility were referred to him, the defender strongly reprimanded or removed to some school for incorrigibles, there would be little need for corporal punishment.

Give power to principals to detain children for punishment at his discretion and reward meritorious pupils on Friday afternoon by dismissal at 2 P. M.

AGNES M. DUNN, Principal P. S. 165, P., Manhattan:

1. No.
2. It is degrading to teacher and pupil.
It engenders revengeful spirit.
It brings about suppression but not good discipline.
4. I do not remember when it was in use.
5. Yes. Parents are largely responsible for this. They and the children should be made to respect the authority of the teachers and principal. This could be brought about by a system of fines for repeated breaking of the rules.

This would be brought about if the principal could suspend or if incorrigible children could be committed to a corrective school by the word of a principal.

6. (a) The erection of a school of correction or many of them through the city, to which refractory pupils might be sent.
- (b) The return of testimonials of merit.
- (c) The return of rolls of honor.
- (d) The dismissal of good children at two o'clock on Friday.
- (e) Principal to have power to detain refractory pupils at noon.
- (f) Longer detention after three o'clock for pupils who are wilfully disobedient.

THOMAS MOORE, Principal P. S. 166, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. I think it brutalizes both teacher and pupil.
4. Better.
5. No.

CECILIA A. FRANCIS, Principal P. S. 168, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.
2. (a) It is brutalizing.
- (b) It has in most cases no immediate effect, for in the poor districts of our city children are so accustomed to it that kindness tempered with firmness is, as I can say from experience, infinitely more effective.
- (c) It is a dangerous power to put into the hands of a number of people, no matter who they are.
- (d) The parent should have the sole right to administer corporal punishment; no stranger should be permitted to touch a child. (See answer to No. 6.)

4. Corporal punishment was abolished long before my day, but I have been interested in the subject and have talked with several retired teachers who were in the schools then and they have spoken of the evils resulting from the practice and its futility as a punishment.

5. I believe that the position of teacher and principal will command respect in nearly every case in a neighborhood. I believe that order and respect maintained by means of the rod would be a very doubtful form of either. Respect depends on the personality of the teacher or principal, not on the punishment.

6. (a) *Principals* should have the *legal* right to summon before them the parents who shirk parental responsibility. If I can secure a personal interview, I generally conquer, but these parents often *will not* come.

- (b) A report from a principal on such case, after an interview, should be sufficient ground for a fine from a civil justice or other official when the parent has made no effort to improve matters. The fine should be, for the first or second offence, a nominal one and for the third time a heavy one. This should be enforced. If principals used judgment, the number of these cases would be almost nothing. I say this from conviction after practical experience in a boys' school in one of the worst sections of the city, a school in which truancy decreased from 50 cases a day, when I first took it, to almost nothing when I left it. There are a few *isolated* cases of boys and girls, too, which should be cases for the courts or the Children's Society (S. P. C. C.), not for the school. I refer to cases where the influence of the child is demoralizing on the class.

MILLICENT BAUM, Principal P. S. 168, P., Manhattan:

1. No, in general. Yes, in extreme cases, with restrictions.
2. (a) Often defeats its own purpose, and degrading in its effects.
 (b) Arouses worst in child and creates spirit of revenge and antagonism.
 (c) Physical force reflects upon the teacher's lack of skill and management.
 (d) A good teacher will study the child and find other methods and devices by which to govern and discipline her class.
4. Can make no comparison. Was not in system at that time.
5. Perhaps if we could have the power without using it, the necessity for its use, I think, would seldom appear.
6. I would suggest that the most experienced teachers be placed in the primary grades, those endowed with sympathy, tact and patience, whose judgment and strong personality could implant the school virtues in the child. The manner of punishment, other than corporal, to be dependent upon the teacher's knowledge of child nature. Also more responsibility fixed upon the parent; where a child becomes a menace to school law and order, such child to be removed, or dealt with in some manner similar to management of truants.

JNO. T. NICHOLSON, Principal P. S. 169, Manhattan:

2. I am in favor of the corporal punishment of children, and have justification in experience as well as in Scripture; but I do not want official authorization to flog my pupils because, in a few extreme cases, it would then become a duty—and I believe whipping another's child is dirty work at best. It is probable that a schedule of offenses could be made, upon conviction of which evidence could be demanded from parents that the child had been punished—it might be, in the case of decrepit parents or widows, by some

authorized official, say the truant officer; but always in the home, not at school.

3. Application of a light rattan to the buttocks of the culprit and, as above stated, under the eye and with the sanction of the parents.

4. I have never known corporal punishment since my connection with the schools, which began in 1888.

5. They frequently taunt teachers with this fact, which brings us really back to the source of the whole trouble, and that is the parent, like "Joseph Vance's" father, mentioned in the first chapter of that new novel; the parents should be punished; a child rarely takes such ground except he discerns the attitude of antagonism at home.

6. One of the problems is to get parents to visit the school. I believe the attitude spoken of above arises from misconceived ideas as to what the modern local school is; parents have known, it may be, only the knout or the blow as vehicles of instruction, and they assume that brutality instead of sympathy is at the base of our structure. I would make the summons from the head of a school to a parent of equal value with a court subpoena, and would compel the parent to consult the principal at times not conflicting with employment. Many cases would be cleaned up this way.

ISABELLA SULLIVAN, Principal P. S. 170, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. I fear the brutalizing effect on the pupil. I fear its degrading effect on the teacher. I fear its excessive use.

4. I do not recall when it was allowed.

5. In some cases.

6. The pupils should know that, to remain in a grade, they must be obedient and attentive, that otherwise they will be sent to a lower grade.

For extreme cases solitary confinement during school hours would have a deterrent effect if there were a suitable place provided in each school.

The sympathetic, strong teacher needs little aid from punishments except in rare cases.

ELOISE K. FISHER, Principal P. S. 170, P., Manhattan:

1. No.

2. While personally I consider that there are a few rare occasions upon which the use of the rod might have a salutary effect, I do not care to get order and discipline in that way.

4. Not having been a member of the profession while corporal punishment was allowed, I am unable to make comparisons.

5. It may in the case of a few incorrigibles.

6. Parents should be compelled to take more responsibility than is now imposed upon them in the case of children who cannot be controlled in school.

HENRY E. JENKINS, Principal P. S. 171, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. (a) It is a reversion to barbarism.

(b) It is opposed to all modern educational ideals.

(c) It has been removed from the Army and Navy, where the discipline is practically perfect now.

(d) It is so surely liable to abuse.

(e) As teacher and principal since March, 1876 (minus eight years), I have never known the need of it. (I have been in about ten or twelve schools from the Battery to Harlem east and west.)

(f) Theoretically (on paper) the present modes of punishment are ample. That they at times fail is due to improper use and lack of proper facilities.

(g) The pupils with whom I have most trouble are subject in many cases to brutal beatings (at home). They seem to be the worse for it.

(h) Beatings make boys often hard and stubborn. If accompanied by sense of injustice the whole moral tone of the boy may be permanently lowered.

3. Nothing to say here.

4. Corporal punishment was abolished before I commenced teaching in March, 1876. I *know* it is better than when I was a pupil of the public schools, even old No. 35, Dr. Hunter's crack school.

5. I think not. I am sure not. What does interfere in certain sections of the City is the knowledge that there seems to be no mode of punishment that is adequate. If there be an incorrigible pupil (boy) he must be given full swing, so that our final decision must be flawless. Then if suspended he will be either returned to same school or to a neighboring one. The pupil naturally feels that that is little or nothing. What is *needed* is your new parental school and such like where genuinely incorrigible pupils shall be placed under proper and judicious restraint. When the news once spreads among the boys, ninety-five per cent. of the lack of order and respect will vanish.

If I whipped pupils they could feel that school life was a war 'twixt them and me and that anything (unfounded) was square. Now I have their respect.

6. If you have proper places of restraint and enough; if the present rules are inflexibly enforced so that no "influence" can overturn a proper decision; then will you find that such disorder as exists in certain sections of the city will end.

The present modes are ample if properly enforced.

MARGARET F. BRANGAN, Principal P. S. 172, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. I think the more it is used, the more it has to be used. Then, too, it surely would have a bad effect upon the majority of our teachers.

4. From the little I remember and from the school tales of most men, it seems to be no worse.

5. I do not.

6. It is about time that parents were made to feel some responsibility. If they were fined when their children did not attend school and made to support them when on account of incorrigibility they were confined in institutions of any kind, we would have very little difficulty with our discipline.

MARY L. BRADY, Principal P. S. 177, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. I think it is brutalizing.

4. I am unable to state, since corporal punishment was permitted at no time in the school in which I served.

5. I do. Just as in the home the knowledge on the part of the children that the authority of the parent is limited would interfere with the proper bringing up of the children, so in the school the sense that the authority of the principal is limited is a deterrent in securing the proper maintenance of order and respect.

6. If the prohibition against corporal punishment were removed, and the child no longer had the knowledge that the principal is restricted in her power, there might be less need of punishment. The child has his ideal of a ruler and one of the chief characteristics of that ideal is power. To bring that ideal down by any act of this ruler, who, in this instance, is the principal of the school, and who to the child represents power, is a strong plea against allowing the child to know that the authority of that power is in any way limited.

JOHN P. CONROY, Principal P. S. 179, Manhattan:

1. Yes.

2. A certain proportion of young pupils appear to be amenable to no other means of discipline as a corrective or a deterrent. The possible evil effects on themselves of their persistent disobedience and disregard of order, their bad example to other law-abiding pupils, the waste of time and loss of instruction to all the pupils occasioned by the disturbance of these unruly pupils, and the effect, physical and mental, on the teacher, resulting in the diminished effectiveness of the teaching, are, in brief, the justification for corporal punishment in the cases in which it should be permitted.

3. The rattan on the hand or as the mother uses the slipper. No teacher should be permitted to administer corporal punishment to any pupil of his class. It should be given by the principal or by a teacher other than teacher of pupil) in presence of the principal. It should be administered only after all the regular modes of punishment have been tried and found ineffective.

4. As teacher and principal I have had no experience where it was permitted.

5. I do. In my experience a good deal of the insubordination, the annoyance, the purposeful inattention of pupils would, in my opinion, never have occurred if such knowledge were not had. Time and time again have unruly pupils, knowing this rule, taunted the teacher with his inability to exercise the only discipline for which respect could be gained. As the child knows that the father has the power and respects accordingly, if not controlled by milder means, so would many of these pupils.

6. Let me say here that I do not consider corporal punishment a cure-all by any means. Much trouble with pupils is due to neglect of duty on part of parents. I would be pleased to see parental schools established, such as are in Providence, R. I., in which *all* the means of discipline are permitted. A temporary sojourn in such an institution, run on the plan of not being a hotel for a vacation, might have effect on parents as well as on pupils.

JNO. E. BROWN, Principal P. S. 180, Manhattan:

1. Yes.
2. (a) A spoiled child can be brought to order, often, by no other means.
 (b) Such a child, realizing the teacher's helplessness, will be maliciously disobedient, giving the teacher more trouble than all the rest of the class; thus depriving the others of their rights.
 (c) The attempt to govern without corporal punishment often degenerates into a government by scolding, standing up, deprivation of recess, detention and other evasive expedients.
 (d) Other forms of punishment, as suspension, expulsion, commitment, are too severe for ordinary breaches of order, and even when deserved require too much time and effort to put into execution.
3. By the principal, in his office, with a light ruler or rattan, on the hand only.
5. Yes; in some cases, but not generally. I have known pupils to maliciously conspire to report that the teacher punished them.
6. I think corporal punishment should have a trial. I realize that a principal's duties will in that case be much more irksome and disagreeable, but I should be willing to give it a trial.

ANNE J. FARLEY, Principal P. S. 183, Manhattan:

1. No.
2. Think that corporal punishment is brutalizing.
4. Was not in the schools before the abolition of corporal punishment.
5. No.
6. Suggest that when children are incorrigible and not under control of parents, nor under good influence at home, they be placed in truant school or some institution. Also suggest that children sent to truant school for first offense have a shorter term. Longer term for second offense, etc.

CECIL A. KIDD, Principal P. S. 184, Manhattan:

4. Have had no experience except in Manhattan. Corporal punishment was abolished before my appointment.

5. Yes. The pupils and parents seem to confound the term corporal punishment with assault. They take the ground that a teacher has no right to lay hold of a boy with reasonable force—to compel him to leave a hall or room in obedience to a reasonable command.

6. (a) Let the By-Laws define clearly what is meant by corporal punishment.

(b) Authorize teachers to use reasonable force to compel a wilful pupil to obey a reasonable command.

(c) Establish a system of parental schools in which atypical children, may be segregated and given work adapted to their peculiar abilities.

JOSEPH H. WADE, Principal P. S. 186, Manhattan:

1. No.

2. My experience, as principal of this school during the past four years, has guided me in giving a negative answer to question 1. While there may be some doubt as to the advisability of using corporal punishment as a method of disciplining one per cent. of my pupils, I believe such form of punishment would be wholly unnecessary with the remaining part of my school. I believe the vast majority of our pupils can be trained to habits of obedience and self-control through the influence of their teachers; the awakening of a right interest in their schoolwork; the systematic enforcement of the regulations of the school, and the active co-operation of parents. I also believe that the establishment of corporal punishment in this school would result in friction with many of the parents of our children, and might cause continual worry for the teachers, without accomplishing the good sought.

4. As corporal punishment was abolished in the schools prior to my appointment as a teacher, I cannot answer this question from any real experience of conditions.

5. I would not say that such knowledge on the part of our pupils has any appreciable effect on the discipline, but I do believe that pupils should be trained to recognize that there exists in the school a real authority to deal with infraction of the rules of good conduct. Furthermore, pupils should be trained to realize that this power can be exercised by those in immediate charge, and if necessary, without delay.

6. Pupils guilty of wilful disorder, continued inattention or interference with the work of the class, should be punished. In the great majority of such cases detention after school, loss of rank or temporary suspension from the class until parents can be reached proves sufficient punishment. Where the misconduct is continued day after day and there is no co-operation by

the parents, where the misconduct becomes insubordination and the presence of the insubordinate pupil is prejudicial to the welfare of the other pupils, I believe the guilty one should be suspended from the school and placed in a reformatory or parental school.

MARY F. McALEER, Principal P. S. 188, G., Manhattan (girls only):

1. No.

2. I understand your meaning to be, "Do you favor" whipping? On general principles, No, as tending to degrade the one who whips more than the one who is whipped, and because it may lead to assault and battery.

4. I have no recollection of a time when it was allowed or administered, so cannot say.

5. I do not believe the great majority of the pupils are affected by this knowledge as the great majority are orderly and respectful, because they have generations back of them that were orderly and respectful. I do know that the bully takes advantage of this knowledge and as all laws are made on account of the few who *will* violate the rights of others, no law should be made that the unruly few can hold over a teacher and use as a threat.

6. I think the nature of the offence and the offender must determine the punishment. I can not devise punishments. I know that very young children should be spanked to teach them there is a will stronger than theirs. There is an interesting case now in the kindergarten of a little boy, five years old, who for weeks has refused to associate or play with the children and who insists on standing all morning. All entreaties, all coercion have been of no avail. The doctor says he is perfectly well. I now think it is time for spanking, since all inducements have failed. So individual cases should be treated according to age, temperament, causes, etc.

SARAH GOLDIE, Principal P. S. 190, Manhattan:

1. No, for girls. Yes, for rebellious boys.

2. *For:* In extreme cases of depravity and lawlessness among boys this kind of punishment should be the last resort. I have had no experience, therefore do not know if the offender would be reformed by it. When parents use it, it sometimes reforms the boy.

Against: It hardens the child. In many cases where parents use this kind of punishment, the child will resort to falsehood in order to escape punishment, thus adding another crime to disobedience.

3. A switching over the lower extremity done by the parent. If the parent should refuse, the janitor could perform it. Cases where it is needed would be very, very rare.

4. Have had no experience with corporal punishment as a means of discipline.

5. Yes, only in rare cases of lawless and rebellious boys.
6. (a) Judges of Children's Court who will pay some regard to the findings of the district superintendent in his trial of bad boys.
(b) A Board of Health which will not attribute all depravity to physical defects.
(c) Rewards such as merit tickets, early dismissal on Friday, etc

SAMUEL LANGER, Acting Principal P. S. 192, Manhattan:

1. No
2. The certainty of abuse is very much greater than the chance of helpfulness. The boy who needs corporal punishment *in school* is the exception. General legislation should not be based on the exceptional child.
5. It does make difficult the maintenance of order, but not of respect.

BOROUGH OF THE BRONX

HIGH SCHOOL

JOHN H. DENBIGH, Principal Morris High School, The Bronx:

1. No.
2. (a) I do not believe it to be necessary.
(b) If introduced it would be difficult to prevent its abuse.
4. In high school work I have not a proper basis for comparison.
5. Not in schools generally. It may be true to a very slight extent of individual cases in certain districts.
6. I am not opposed to corporal punishment in certain cases. I am opposed to its introduction into the schools generally. I would therefore suggest the commitment of incorrigible cases to a special school for periods of time varying in length according to the nature of the case.

If (and only if) such a special school were under the right man, I think corporal punishment might very well be permitted in it.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

KATE VAN WAGENEN, Principal P. S. 2, The Bronx:

1. Yes.
2. Much valuable time is wasted in writing notes, interviewing parents, etc., when a case could frequently be settled by punishing the child and returning him to his class. When a child openly defies his teacher, the punishment should be *swift* and *certain*. The knowledge that punishment may only be inflicted at some future time, by the parent, induces the child to take a long chance, in the hope that something will intervene to prevent its infliction. The statement that the schools of this City are controlled by moral suasion is a polite fiction. They are controlled by corporal punishment pure and simple, but it is now corporal punishment administered by the parent. The fact that children do defy authority in school, with impunity, is bearing fruit in the numbers of children arrested on the streets for lawlessness.
3. Under no circumstances whatever should corporal punishment be administered by the teachers, because young teachers are woefully lacking both in power to discipline and in judgment, and it would be barbarous to punish a child for a teacher's defects. A principal could be vested with the proper authority, and if he had not-requisite judgment he should not be principal. A report of each case could be made to district superintendent, to prevent abuse.
4. Have always served in Manhattan and Bronx, where corporal punishment has been prohibited.
5. I certainly do.

CHARLES M. BABCOCK, Principal P. S. 3, Gr., The Bronx:

1. Yes.
2. Some evil doers can be influenced in no other way.
It will induce parents to assume greater responsibility than they now do.
The deterrent effect on all boys who are disposed to evil will be marked.
3. Whipping, under the supervision of the principal, or by him.
4. Discipline is now bad. Had no experience before its abolition.
5. Yes.

ANGELO PATRI, Principal P. S. 4, The Bronx:

1. Yes.
2. (a) Immediate, direct result of offense, appeals to young children, least cruel.
(b) Certain type of child must be whipped. If school authorities do not somebody must (parent or guardian brought to school by the principal). School here merely shifts the burden. Where this type of child fears no such punishment because none is given, he becomes truant from school and home.
(c) Other forms of government tend to minimize the use of corporal punishment, but can never take place of it completely.
(d) Corporal punishment is used now, by parent or others. Why is not the principal better able to administer such punishment?
3. (a) 1. Bad language to teacher or direct attack on teacher.
2. Absolute refusal to obey orders, when such disobedience tends to demoralize condition of class.
3. To avoid *panics*.
4. Wilful destruction of property.
(b) 1. By principal or some one deputed by him.
2. Use of strap, private or public as case demands.
3. Never punish child more than *twice*, then report to superintendent.
Book kept of offense and punishment.
4. Never by a teacher.
4. I do not know.
5. Yes. Parents have sometimes given me written permission in the presence of the child to whip the boy. This fact has been enough to keep the child in the straight path, and I have never found it was necessary to use the power given me by the parent.

WM. J. KENNARD, Principal P. S. 5, The Bronx:

1. Yes, in boys' schools or classes.
2. Because I know of the need of it in the schools of my professional brethren in some sections of the City. In the school of which I have charge the use of

it would be infinitesimal, and yet the discipline could be made better even than it is, and there would be less wear and tear on the teachers' nerves.

3. Same as formerly, before its abolishment.
4. Personally, for my own school, no difference.
5. I certainly do.
6. No answer.

P. S.—I most emphatically think that this question should not be put to principals of girls' schools. The matter of corporal punishment does not concern them. There can be but one answer from them.

P. STEVENS, Jr., Principal P. S. 6, The Bronx:

1. Yes, I favor the *legalizing* of corporal punishment.
2. Because corporal punishment has *not* been abolished, but exists in all or nearly all schools to a degree varying according to a number of conditions. The By-Law does not exist for a teacher driven to desperation by defiance, profanity, obscenity or even personal violence. Teachers then go ahead and take chances, and in the rare cases where complaints come before school boards, there is evident sympathy for the accused and a disposition to "white-wash." This is bad because (1) we are at present occupying a hypocritical position in relation to this matter, (2) respect for regulations generally is weakened, (3) punishment is administered in the heat of passion and may be unduly severe.
3. The old-fashioned method, applied by the principal or a person authorized by him, and never in presence of other pupils.
4. I am not old enough to answer this.
5. Most emphatically yes.

ISAAC B. SPRAGUE, Principal P. S. 7, The Bronx:

1. Yes.
2. I do not believe corporal punishment should be inflicted except in extreme cases and not until all other means of enforcing obedience have been found useless. Every child should be taught that there is some power in the school that he must respect, or serious consequences will result. That knowledge will be a great deterrent to evil-doers. The infliction of corporal punishment is repugnant to me, but it seems to be the only efficient remedy in extreme cases.
3. The principal should be allowed *considerable latitude* in the method of punishment, and should be the *only one* to administer it.
4. The most effective kind of punishment seems to be the use of the *rod*, if judiciously applied.
5. It seems to me to be *worse*.
6. I certainly do, and that is one of my strongest reasons for recommending its use. The knowledge that the principal has the power to use corporal punishment will have such an effect upon the children that it will seldom be necessary to administer it.

JOHN T. NOLAN, Principal P. S. 8, The Bronx:

1. No.

4. I find the discipline better since the abolition of corporal punishment.

5. No.

WILLIAM RABENORT, Principal P. S. 9, The Bronx:

1. No.

2. Those pupils who would be amenable to the light forms of corporal punishment can be controlled without it by the means now at our command; hardened and incorrigible children cannot be reformed by this form of punishment, as experience has amply shown. The beatings they receive at home are far more severe than could be administered at school, and therefore the less harsh punishment does not inspire the respect necessary to command obedience.

4. I did not teach in New York City when corporal punishment was permitted. The discipline that I have seen in this city, though far from perfect, is better than that obtained in many towns where corporal punishment is permitted.

5. Only in those cases where other adequate punishment is not inflicted. I would not be understood as expressing satisfaction with the condition of discipline in the schools, but as voicing the belief that such provisions as are suggested in answer to number 6 would do more to maintain order than the knowledge that corporal punishment may be inflicted.

6. The policy of segregating all pupils who by reason of physical defects, mental incompetence, or moral perversity are unfit to pursue work in classrooms with normal pupils is the only solution for the problem of discipline.

It is an enormously expensive solution, because almost no steps have as yet been taken in this direction, our ungraded classes and special classes being the merest beginning. Unless progress is made *on a large scale* toward the provision of rooms for abnormal pupils, and for schools for more marked types of these children it is useless to look for much improvement in the discipline of our schools.

JOHN F. CONDON, Principal P. S. 12, The Bronx:

1. No. It degrades the pupil, it is a parent's duty, not an educator's.

2. It produces physical pain merely which by constant application blunts the finer feelings, hardens the flesh, and the real motive for punishment, viz.: "formation of correct habits, a guide to higher ideals and a nobler motive in general are entirely or too often neglected.

Besides, from a legal standpoint, it is a mooted question and in certain cases judgment has been rendered.

3. No one should administer corporal punishment except a parent or guardian in parental relation.

4. The discipline has improved. The standards of the pupils have been elevated through proper instruction under the able guidance and management of Dr. William H. Maxwell.

5. No. They can be brought to a realization of right and the difference between right and wrong by conscientious parents, teachers and proper enforcement of just laws, school in particular and civic in general.

6. The body should not be punished for the evil workings of the soul.

(a) I would suggest proper moral training with right as a goal.

(b) Moral suasion.

(c) Justice to all pupils (alike).

(d) Detention to make up lost time.

(e) Co-operation with parents.

(f) Insist on obedience in all cases regardless of consequences.

BERNARD J. DEVLIN, Principal P. S. 13, The Bronx:

1. No.

2. (a) In my own experience I have not needed it.

(b) Its presence might tend to lower ideals of conduct, etc.

(c) The knowledge of its absence and the recognition of the necessity for order and obedience on the part of the pupils emphasize the influence of the moral.

(d) There is danger that it would be considered by teachers a panacea for all school ills.

(e) There is danger that the parents of delinquents would shift the responsibility to the schools rather than assume it themselves.

4. I have never had any experience with corporal punishment in schools. I have always had excellent discipline without it.

5. Yes, with a very few pupils.

6. Principals should have some power to compel parents to punish. I believe that some children, possibly through the fourth year of school life, need corporal punishment at times, but I do not think our schools are the place for it.

PHILIP O'RYAN, Principal P. S. 14, The Bronx:

1. Yes.

2. It is the only logical thing, unless some other adequate penalty is provided for a disorderly few. Good children have interests that are now jeopardized.

3. I would have a mild castigation administered by the principal or some teacher designated for the purpose. I would have recourse to corporal punishment only when all other means had failed.

4. Decidedly worse.

5. A disorderly pupil can now say to his teacher: "You dare not touch me." The boy knows that the teacher's hands are tied and he is not backward at telling her so.

On the contrary, if corporal punishment was restored, it would be seldom necessary to use it.

A few refractory pupils in every school despise present methods.

6. The teacher occupies for the time being the place of the parent. That being the case, he should have the power, as the parent has, of enforcing his commands.

MARY O'CONNOR, Principal P. S. 15, The Bronx:

1. No.

2. In the cases of incorrigible children who came under my observation whose parents claimed they had administered severe corporal punishment, I found invariably that the children were only more confirmed in their waywardness.

5. With impressionable children the consciousness of the possibility of punishment has, no doubt, a restraining influence.

6. There should be a school, other than the elementary school, for such children, where manual work would have special consideration. The children who fail in obedience to the rules in the elementary schools are those who are anxious to go to work.

ELIJAH JENKS, Jr., Principal P. S. 16, The Bronx:

1. Yes.

2. For the 99½ per cent. I do not believe corporal punishment necessary; the ½ per cent.—the persistently disobedient and lawless—require a strong deterrent. At present there seems to be no way to reach these latter and save the time of the other pupils. If the fact that it could be inflicted were known, I believe the actual use would be very rare.

3. I presume the rattan would be the best form. The power to use the same should be in the hands of the principal, and its use should be a last resort. It might be a check to the abuse of it if it were required to report to the district superintendent every infliction of the penalty and the cause thereof.

4. I cannot say, as corporal punishment has always been prohibited in my time.

5. I certainly do. I thoroughly believe that very few principals would need to use corporal punishment were the pupils aware that the power was lodged with the principal.

CHARLES C. HOLDEN, Principal P. S. 17, The Bronx:

1. Yes.
2. The unruly boy, with little or no home training in self-control, is often quickly brought to a sense of the necessity of conforming strictly to rules by a few sharp strokes that produce physical pain.
3. Punishment inflicted on the palm with flat stick, and always in the presence of at least one other teacher, and only after such punishment is considered to be necessary.
4. I was not in the system when corporal punishment was abolished.
5. Yes; I have heard boys say tauntingly: "The teacher does not dare to touch me." I believe there would be little or no occasion to punish a child corporally if he were aware that such punishment might be administered.
6. I believe in corporal punishment only as a last resort, and would sooner punish a child in some other way. Here I have almost no occasion for it. Our children are almost uniformly respectful and obedient.

MARY A. CURTIS, Principal P. S. 20, The Bronx:

1. No.
2. In my district, and especially in No. 20, corporal punishment is unnecessary.
4. Having had no experience with corporal punishment, I am not in a position to judge.
5. In certain localities I firmly believe it does.
6. I believe some other form of punishment should be devised, but will leave suggestions to those who come in contact with such pupils, who are eminently better qualified to suggest the remedies to meet the various situations.

ELIZA A. CATERSON, Principal P. S. 21, The Bronx:

1. No.
2. The power to inflict corporal punishment might be abused.
4. I have never had the power delegated to me to use corporal punishment.
5. I do.
6. The establishment of reform schools to which disobedient and incorrigible pupils might be sent and there properly governed and trained during a period of detention, might have a good, deterrent effect.

ELIZABETH C. KELLY, Acting Principal P. S. 22, The Bronx:

1. No.
2. I am not in favor of it, as I think it a step backward in our progression. I believe I am not in a position to judge, as I am in charge of a small school of eight classes, which is situated in a fairly good neighborhood, and consequently I have never been put to the test.

4. I attended and, until very lately, taught in the schools of Manhattan Borough, and do not remember corporal punishment being used in the schools; consequently I cannot say whether the discipline is better or worse since its abolition.

5. I do believe that, as there is virtually no punishment at hand, the children take advantage of it and are, some of them, at times disrespectful and more than disrespectful.

6. I believe that the principal should be vested with more power and be able to punish in some manner, but I am not prepared to say how to any great extent. However, I would suggest that, the principal having communicated with the parents of an incorrigible child and no improvement resulting, such child be suspended and sent for a time to a reformatory school or to a truant school, and this punishment enforced.

JOHN KING CLARK, Principal P. S. 23, The Bronx:

1. No.

2. Superimposed authority is destructive of self-government. The highest aim of discipline should be self-discipline. Fear of bodily suffering is a motive fit for dumb animals only, and often is inefficient with them. To inflict corporal punishment will not develop what is best, but what is worst in the child.

4. Better.

5. No. Not if principal and teacher are constantly appealing to the better nature of the child. Everything depends upon the spirit that pervades the school.

FRANK A. YOUNG, Principal P. S. 25, The Bronx:

1. No.

2. (a) I believe the parents should inflict corporal punishment if it is to be inflicted. They have *some* duties yet.

(b) I do not think the effect on a teacher or principal who inflicts it is good.

(c) The effect on the pupil is not always so beneficial as its advocates claim.

(d) I fear that teachers would not always exhaust other and better means to discipline children if this form of punishment should be introduced.

(e) They would feel, perhaps, that they were not properly supported if the punishment were not *frequently* administered.

(f) A whole chain of complications and troubles growing out of this form of punishment would certainly result, such as arrests for assaults, etc. These answers are not exhaustive.

(g) In the hands of a young teacher corporal punishment is a dangerous resource.

4. I did not teach in New York prior to its abolition. I taught about seven years in Connecticut, in which State the law sanctioned it and a teacher or principal was virtually *obliged* to use it or be considered a weak disciplinarian by the community. I also taught fourteen years in New Jersey, in which State corporal punishment is strictly prohibited. I am certain that I had as well disciplined a school and as respectful pupils in New Jersey as I had in Connecticut.

5. In the case of exceptionally bad boys, such knowledge probably adds to their aggressiveness. Some boys virtually dare a teacher to touch them, it is true. But the greater number of pupils are orderly and I believe have a *greater respect* for their school because physical force is *not* resorted to.

The conquest of reason is more far-reaching in its effect than that of physical force.

6. I think the exceptional cases referred to in answer to question 5 can be reached by giving principals more power in some ways.

Temporary suspension for from one to five days, carrying with it more power to summon parents and to require parents to keep the pupil in his home during the time, etc., and to give some guarantee that they will co-operate *continuously* as requested, would do a great deal of good.

Probably it will help materially to have more schools to which incorrigibles could be sent a little more summarily than at present.

THOMAS J. MEIGHAN, Principal P. S. 27, The Bronx:

1. No.

2. It is a relic of barbarism and I am convinced by long experience that it is not an effective means of control.

4. I am not able to answer as I have never used corporal punishment in school.

5. I believe it does *not* in this school.

JOHN T. MAGUIRE, Principal P. S. 29, The Bronx:

1. Yes.

2. My experience has taught me that there are instances in which moral suasion fails, and a resort to corporal punishment is absolutely necessary for the individual's benefit as well as for that of the class.

3. A few strokes of the rattan, applied to the boy's hands or backside, in presence of the class, said punishment to be inflicted by the principal only.

4. Worse.

5. Decidedly, yes.

MARY A. CONLON, Principal P. S. 30, The Bronx:

1. No.
2. I can and have always been able to manage my school without corporal punishment.
4. Corporal punishment has not been used during my experience in schools.
5. It may, in certain schools.
6. I find present provisions sufficient.

GUSTAVE A. CARLS, Principal P. S. 32, The Bronx:

1. No.
2. No matter how judiciously applied it is more or less brutalizing in its effects. It is rarely corrective. Rarely produces result it is intended to produce. Makes children hypocritical—they give unwilling, sullen, obedience. It is the discipline of fear and tends to make children revengeful. There is danger that at times it might be applied to defectives or degenerates who rather need medical attention.
4. I have no personal knowledge of this matter.
5. In certain sections of the city—yes.
In my neighborhood—no.
6. Present methods of punishment are adequate in my school.

WILLIAM N. STORY, Principal P. S. 34, The Bronx:

1. Yes.
2. It is the only way (the present law being practically inoperative) to deal with *very* difficult cases.
3. To be at the discretion of the principal upon the written statement of the teacher.
4. Corporal punishment has not been used since my appointment.
5. I am of the belief that this fact causes a large part of the trouble.

ELLEN MURRAY, Principal P. S. 38, The Bronx:

1. No.
2. The great majority of pupils are amenable to school discipline. Extreme methods are only necessary with incorrigible children. These the parents should be compelled to discipline.
5. Yes, in some instances.
6. The principal should have the power to suspend pupils guilty of insubordination for long or short periods, as the case may require. Not enough authority is vested in the principal. Magistrates should deal more severely with juvenile offenders.

EMILIE J. LICHTENSTEIN, Principal P. S. 39, The Bronx:

1. If you refer to the rod to be administered by the principal or teachers—
No.
2. Degrading.
3. I think parents of incorrigible pupils might be asked to punish them in school.
4. I was not in the school system when corporal punishment was used, therefore cannot compare conditions.
5. Yes.
6. Fines imposed upon parents of incorrigible pupils.

BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN

TRAINING SCHOOL

EMMA L. JOHNSTON, Principal Brooklyn Training School for Teachers:

1. No.

2. We principals and teachers are not yet noble enough and wise enough as a class to be trusted so far. When we have learned what love for humanity really is, and when we have that love it will not be necessary to make prohibitive laws regarding our treatment of children; it will be safe then to allow us to act in any given case in the way that we think will be for the child's good.

3. If administered at all it should be by the principal only, and then only after the parent has been notified that it is about to be inflicted.

4. As I never inflicted corporal punishment even when it was not forbidden, I notice no change.

5. Not in the right kind of school.

6. I should not know how to devise forms of punishment. No two children are alike. Each middle-sized and each big boy and girl must be studied as the kindergartner studies each child in her class. The kindergartner does not ask for "forms of punishment." Teaching (including class management) is a fine art. Teachers should learn the art.

HIGH SCHOOLS

JAMES SULLIVAN, Principal Boys' High School, Brooklyn:

1. (I understand elementary schools) Yes.

2. I think that for some children the only thing which appeals to them is corporal punishment. A child which has to be brought from the almost savage instincts of infancy to the twentieth century world to live in, inside of eight to fourteen years, has to have drastic means pursued some time.

3. By the principal with a rattan privately.

5. Yes.

6. A record of each punishment administered, the nature of the offense, the teacher calling for it, the name of the pupil, the name of the principal, the number of previous offenses of the pupil, etc., should be carefully kept. A teacher having an excess of punishments or a principal having an excess should have the matter taken up by the superintending force.

WM. T. VLYMEN, Principal Eastern District High School, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. Least cruel, saves many a boy, is necessary even in a family, is universal and most direct, controls boys who cannot be controlled in any other way.
3. To be administered by principal only, who shall be the sole judge of its necessity. To be applied with a suitable instrument on the hands or on the cushion provided by nature.
4. I don't know, but I can readily believe that it must be worse. In the high school corporal punishment is not and should not be used.

W. B. GUNNISON, Principal Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. For *some* offenses it is the most effective method. Many dispositions at certain ages are in need of strong, immediate, restrictive treatment. This does not mean there are not other methods, but the good of the many should be subserved, this at times is the *best*. The fact that it is known to be *forbidden* encourages the vicious.
3. That form which the occasion seems to demand in the mind of an intelligent man of judgment who knows all the facts. It should be reasonable, and of course should only be used when very necessary—a last resort.
4. Personally I never used it except when quite young, and so I can only express an opinion based on hearsay and inference. I would say that in some particulars the discipline is less effective.
5. With certain pupils, yes.
6. In answering the above of course I believe that in most cases corporal punishment should be avoided. Other methods are more effective in the long run, but to take it out of the power of a wise, judicious administrant, who, on the spot, judges it the best plan for a certain case, is unwise in the highest degree.

WM. L. FELTER, Principal Girls' High School, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. There are some natures that can be reached in no other way. The possibility of such punishment often deters from wrong-doing. It is better to keep the pupil in school under instruction with occasional chastisement than to exclude him from school and expose him to vicious influences on the street.
3. Upon the palms of the hands and upon the buttocks, with rod or ruler. This method should be resorted to only when all others have failed. Pedagogues are agreed that punishment should never be given in anger, and only after due deliberation.

4. No corporal punishment exists in this school. Judging from reports of principals of elementary schools, however, as they have spoken to me upon the subject, the discipline is worse in those schools since corporal punishment has been abolished.

5. Yes. In the natures which need the physical argument to convince them of their wrong doing.

CHARLES D. LARKINS, Principal Manual Training High School, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Sometimes, but not often, it is necessary. It is less necessary to use corporal punishment than to have certain child dispositions conscious of the fact that it may be resorted to if necessary. The pupil must be conscious of the teachers' authority even if that authority is never used.

4. We never use it in the high school, and should not do so probably if we were allowed to do so. I ask the father once in a long time to do it for me.

5. In the case of certain pupils.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

C. D. FLEMING, Principal P. S. 1, Brooklyn.:

October 22, 1907.

HON. NATHAN S. JONAS,

Chairman Special Committee.

DEAR SIR: In answer to the series of questions propounded in your circular letter of October 14, I should prefer, with your permission, to deal with them at greater length than can be done by categorical answers.

It has ever been my purpose to establish, if possible, a science of discipline, based upon an attempt to classify offenses and punishments.

To illustrate my method of disciplining, let us assume that a pupil of this school is disorderly in the classroom. He is called to order by his teacher. In a short while she is again forced to speak to the boy. A third time proves annoying and she calls him to her desk and informs him that she is keeping a memorandum of his offenses, and purposes sending him with it to the office. However, no teacher sends a boy to the office for discipline without having spoken to me in advance. Usually a time limit is placed on the mischievous boy, sometimes an hour, a half day, or even a day, the shortness of time being measured by the seriousness of his offense.

At this point it becomes necessary to inform you that at the end of each term a record is made by the teacher of all her pupils. This record shows the child's likes and dislikes, favorite studies, whether obliging, honest, truthful, punctual, regular, etc., etc., or their negatives.

On the pupil's appearance, then, at the office with a memorandum of his misdeeds, I look up this character sketch, which furnishes me with a valu-

able line on the kind of boy to be dealt with. I inquire into the cause of complaint and get him to admit, deny or qualify the charge. My first treatment consists of a friendly talk which extracts a promise of good behavior. Thereupon the boy is ordered back to his classroom. These successive steps, as noted above, are again gone over if he persists in his disorder, and a second time he is sent to the office. I now apply a stimulus.

For the purpose of ascertaining proper stimuli I have studied boys and have found that all are willing to be punished for offenses against school law, provided that every child receives the same punishment for similar offenses. First, however, there must be a conviction, either by confession or by weight of evidence. This is simply a recognition of the possession on the child's part of an elemental sense of justice. My position is immeasurably strengthened by the employment of sympathy as well as justice. Further I have found *all* boys desire to be big, to be strong, to be successful. As a result of this study I have worked out a table to be employed in the following order:

Love of parent,	Promotion,
Approbation of teacher and principal,	Rivalry,
Public opinion of class and school,	Pride,
Ambition,	Demotion,
Training of faculties,	Ridicule,
Success,	Shame.

Time is an element of all stimuli. That is, but one stimulus at a time is employed and at definite intervals. The boy must present to me at a certain specified time a report from his teacher upon the point at issue. The length of time depends upon the degree of turpitude involved. If he be a vicious boy, perhaps the next day I ask for this report and his return; in some cases only a few hours have been allowed. A failure in disciplining is frequently made by exhorting, entreating, commanding, ridiculing, reprimanding, etc., all at the same interview. This arouses a sense of injustice in the boy against the person in authority. Absolute justice and impartiality must obtain before a teacher can be a successful disciplinarian.

Upon the pupil's appearance at the office, I make an intensive study of the case and arrive at a decision which stimulus will most likely produce the desired result. A term of probation is determined upon, and at the end of it the teacher submits a report, stating the improvement or lack of it, in the original items of complaint. The length of the probationary term is determined by the gravity of the charge. It will be noticed that the work of teacher and principal is nearly identical, with the exception that the principal has the privilege of sending for parent.

To illustrate the application of treatment in a specific instance I submit the following: A mother interviewed me about her son, who was constantly coming late. She had exhausted all her remedies to induce punctuality. I referred to my records and had a talk with the boy. I found that he was very much attached to his mother and would like to do as she asked but was

weak in will power. I suggested that he astonish his mother by having no lateness on his report card for a month; asking him if he did not think that would please her. He felt sure it would and promised to try. During the first month his lateness was reduced fully two-thirds; in the second month up to the time a transfer was given him, in the second week, he had not been late. I believe a cure would have eventually been worked if he had remained in No. 1.

Another means of discipline that is employed in this school is called "absent treatment." It is extended to the pupil in the classroom by the teacher telling me that a certain pupil has been disorderly. With a look of astonishment on my face I turn my gaze on the pupil in question, but without saying anything. The teacher continues to recite the misdeeds, in a tone unheard by the class. There is a strained silence on the other pupils' part, my face undergoes several shades of displeasure, the teacher and I both look at the boy, she nods her head as she finishes. My turn now comes, and with significant gesture, I shake my head most emphatically, say something for some seconds, always unheard by the class; then I close with, "Now you understand?"—this latter expression aloud. The boy meanwhile has become anxious, not knowing what next will occur, gets to work, glances at us slyly, flushes in some cases, and in all instances is extremely uneasy. I employ this absent treatment where I have exhausted all my devices, and in a majority of instances it works successfully.

Having described in brief the system of discipline that obtains in this school, you are prepared to understand my position in regard to corporal punishment. I believe it has a place as a stimulus analogous to alcohol in medicine. That is, its use is liable to end in its abuse. Another danger is that it may become the core of discipline of a school, and all cases be subjected to its standard; whereas, a true employment of it as a stimulus will admit of it only on rare occasions and after all other methods have been employed. It also tends to do away with experimentation in finding devices to fit infractions of school laws. In No. 1 no necessity for corporal punishment exists; yet I will admit that at times I would have employed it if permitted by the By-Laws of the Board. This desire was prompted by a knowledge of my impotence to deal adequately with the boy in question.

In time a science of discipline will be evolved which will place it upon a parity with instruction. It is, in my opinion, of greater value than instruction. I believe further that the Board of Education could well afford to establish a school of experimentation to search and apply devices and stimuli in cases that try the patience of the regular teacher. The register of that school might be recruited from an entire borough, and furnish us with means to meet unruly children.

I recommend trials by principals of suspended pupils; an exchange of disorderly pupils between schools, whose principals can arrange a *modus vivendi*—this without the intervention of the district superintendent; character record of all pupils to be made each term, to be sent from school to

school at time of transfer with transfer cards; and an attempt to classify disciplinary cases by sending to a superintendent in charge an account of unusual cases and their treatment.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

C. D. FLEMING

F. B. STEVENS, Principal P. S. 2, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. It is the most practical help for boys who need it. Fifty-eight out of sixty-three teachers in this school favor placing it in the hands of the principal.
3. Should be administered by principal only. Only boys whose parents will not or cannot control them should be subjected to it.
4. Worse, and harder to get.
5. It surely does.
6. Beside restoring corporal punishment to the schools we need in some way to get reasonable support for teachers and principals from the press, from parents and from the Children's Courts. Something should be done to either prevent unfounded complaints being made against teachers and principals or some means found to punish those who make them.

L. H. WHITE, Principal P. S. 3, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. (a) It becomes a substitute for the development of a motive for right doing.
- (b) It is sometimes brutal.
- (c) It create hostile relations in the mind of the child toward school and teachers.
4. Discipline of No. 3 is as good and character growth is better.
5. Yes. I believe Fitch in his lectures to teachers is right when he says he does not wish to use corporal punishment, nor does he wish anybody to legislate that he cannot. The question should be left with the principal, as are other questions of administration.
6. To some extent the answer to this question is a local one, and the method depends upon personality of principal and teachers and clientele.

T. F. DOWNEY, Principal P. S. 4, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. To check recalcitrant children, with no respect of authority, who exist in the school as criminals exist in communities, and for the proper management of the school.
3. The judicious use of a rattan, used only in extreme cases by the principal of the school.
4. Worse.

5. Yes. "Yellow journals" keep the children of the city informed from time to time that corporal punishment cannot be inflicted no matter how seriously they may offend against the school laws, and this knowledge leads the children, who are prone to evil, to follow the evil tenor of their way, with impunity and disregard of respect to *all school* authority.

EDITH HORTON, Principal P. S. 7, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. I consider corporal punishment outside the province of an educational institution. Its tendency is to demoralize, not to elevate.
4. No difference.
5. In my experience, it does not.
6. More *immediate* punishment for an offender. More power given the principal in cases of suspension and commitment might restrain many from wrongdoing.

MARY WALSEMANN, Principal P. S. 8, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. I believe that the mere knowledge that "corporal punishment" is legal would *very* materially lessen the actual need for its administration.
3. If corporal punishment were legal I think it would be to the child's advantage to have it administered only for certain offenses and this only by the principal or in the principal's presence. I also recommend that a ruling be made that each district superintendent be notified of the administration of corporal punishment.
4. Not having been in the schools before its abolition I am unable to answer but would say that children coming from homes where there is a *judicious* use of the rod make better pupils than those from other homes.
5. Most decidedly.
6. While I do approve of corporal punishment, I can see that a great deal depends on the humanity and sense of justice of the teachers and the principal. To me the only possible objection lies in the fact that these qualities cannot always be depended upon. I do think we could manage very well without corporal punishment if we had a disciplinary school and junior industrial schools—the first for unruly pupils, unruly through innate tendencies; the second for unruly pupils, unruly through lack of interest in work because they know they will leave school soon.

WILLIAM M. RAINEY, Principal P. S. 9, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. (a) Because it would make discipline more difficult, creating a spirit of hatred and opposition.
- (b) Because of its brutalizing effects on the victim.

- (c) Because it may become a menace to all children whose little lapses have no viciousness in them.
 - (d) Because such punishment is only a temporary deterrent, exacts an unwilling obedience, and has no educative value.
 - (e) The incorrigible too often needs the care of a physician or the knife of a surgeon rather than the rod. He needs a cure more than a cane.
4. From personal experience I do not know. From the stories I have heard of the "olden days," present conditions are vastly better.
5. In my experience, the authority of the principal has been all sufficient to secure obedience and maintain respect and good order. I admit, however, that there may be localities where good discipline and prompt obedience may be made more difficult to secure by reason of such knowledge. I believe principals and teachers should be authorized to use force, if necessary, to secure obedience in emergencies, where the offense is such that property is destroyed or the lives or safety of others is endangered.

OLIVER C. MORDORF, Principal P. S. 10, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
 2. Insubordination to rightful authority should be met by force. When a pupil rebels against the teacher, the use of the rod is justifiable. *Open defiance* not only *justifies*, but makes *necessary* a resort to corporal punishment. Suspension is not always feasible. The boy is driven to the street or some other school (hardly fair). A bad boy *should be controlled in the school*.
- The law recognizes the teacher "*in loco parentis*." Surely the average teacher or principal is as *humane* as the average parent. Most of the great educators favor it—*Horace Mann, Rosenkranz, Locke, Wickersham, Page*, and others.
3. Use the time-honored birch on back—*privately* (not before class). Limit its use to the principal, who should keep a record of amount, kind, frequency, etc.
- There should be no brutality or serious bodily injuries. The punishment should begin in moderation. If child fails to obey, becoming insubordinate or profane, the punishment should be increased.
- Utmost discretion and tact are needed. Pupil should realize the necessity for corporal punishment. It should be inflicted *humanely* and in *extreme* cases.
4. I have never taught or supervised in this city when corporal punishment was in vogue, hence cannot answer intelligently. I can discipline *without*, if I *must*, but extreme cases need extreme treatment.
 5. Yes. I have heard pupils with brazen-faced effrontery quote the law, "You daren't touch me."
- One of the strongest arguments in favor of corporal punishment is that it has a *deterrent effect*. This is one of the chief objects of all punishment. The very knowledge that bodily pain *may follow* a course of misconduct will ma-

terially aid in *lessening* that misconduct. Oftentimes the higher perceptions of offenders are closed against appeals of moral suasion. According to the culture epoch theory, many of these are passing through the stage of savagery. Such need heroic treatment. My own experience in Pennsylvania proves its worth. Several bad boys were thoroughly reformed by a wholesome use of the rod.

F. F. HARDING, Principal P. S. 11, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Bodily punishment is inflicted by nature for infringements of her laws. Often the slightest infraction bringing severe penalty. Is nature cruel or beneficent?

(b) Corporal punishment has been recommended and inflicted by the wisest *parents* and *educators* since time has made a record for us, and its good effects vouched for both by those inflicting it and by those upon whom it has been inflicted.

(c) Kant says, "It is labor lost to speak of duty to children." I think when "all motives carefully graded through a long series of increasing privations and penalties" have failed, it is better to appeal to this extreme remedy rather than permit a bad habit to be fastened on a child or to confine him in a so-called "reformatory."

(d) The State law grants us the *right* to stand "in loco parentis" to the child, and no Board of Education should nullify a law-supposed to be founded on reasonable experience.

(e) In cases where parents are appealed to, corporal punishment is often inflicted, and often brings good results when *properly* inflicted.

3. Smaller boys should be punished with the palm of the hand, and larger boys with a ruler or a broad strap.

The punishment should be inflicted by the principal or by some teacher delegated by him to punish.

The infliction of punishment should be with the consent of the parent, should be in private, and in the presence of at least one other person besides the boy punished and the person inflicting the punishment.

4. It is more difficult to maintain proper discipline than formerly, when corporal punishment was permitted.

5. I most certainly believe this to be the case. Boys have been known to defy their teachers, to taunt them with lack of authority to inflict corporal punishment, have used vile and profane language to them, and have hurled missiles at them and even struck them, well knowing their immunity from punishment of a bodily nature.

The effect of such lawlessness may well be imagined upon the offender himself and upon the other pupils of the class.

It also becomes necessary, especially under young and inexperienced teachers, to appeal more frequently to the principal, and the pupil soon learns of the limit of his authority even.

A loss of respect for authority in general is engendered, and the position of principal is lowered in respect and dignity.

6. I desire here respectfully to state my position in relation to corporal punishment.

I believe it should be resorted to only after all other means have failed, excepting only removal to a "reformatory" institution. It should be considered as "an injury to the person inflicting it," and a deep disgrace to the sufferer.

I am not in favor of its continuance when it becomes evident, as it sometimes does, that it is not producing beneficial results. In fact, I am in favor of *this* kind of punishment in the same way I am in favor of *any* kind of punishment, namely, when, and only when, it is necessary for the reform of the child. The argument that it should be discontinued because it has been abused may be used for every other kind of punishment. To argue that it is brutal or brutalizing is to beg the question, and to assert that it causes the boy to hate his teacher is not susceptible of proof as a general proposition. The principal should be subject to the same law that governs the parent for any abuse of his authority.

No sentimentality should have weight in the settlement of this very important question, nor should misrepresentation be mistaken for argument. Sound judgment based upon experience should prevail.

WILLIS A. HUNTLEY, Principal P. S. 12, Brooklyn:

1. In very * extreme cases, yes.

2. If the right to make use of corporal punishment is *entirely* withheld, incorrigible pupils have not that respect for authority which they would have if they knew that in * extreme cases corporal punishment could be practiced.

3. * My use of "extreme" above, I will explain as an answer to "3." In cases of incorrigible boys, where every possible mode of correction has been resorted to, and parents have been notified in writing, the right to use corporal punishment should be given to the principal of a school, *if* he has *written* consent of both parent and district superintendent.

4. Worse.

5. The said knowledge does not interfere with maintenance of order except in certain "extreme" cases, as indicated under heading "3."

ELLEN F. QUINN, Principal P. S. 14, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. I favor corporal punishment because of the bad example given by those who persistently defy the established authority of the school, and who cannot be restrained by any milder form of discipline.

3. The use of a rattan applied to the hands and the punishment administered in the presence of some person other than the one who has made the complaint.

5. Yes.

ANDREW I. SHERMAN, Principal P. S. 15, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. My reasons against corporal punishment are in brief as follows:

Degrading to both teacher and pupil. The evils that we seek to cure are mental. They can be cured only by inducing a different state of mind. This cannot be done in majority of cases by beating the flesh.

I used corporal punishment very rarely when I had the power. There are a few rare cases when I think the child would be benefited by corporal punishment. In most such cases it can be brought about through father and mother.

4. Practically the same with us. Slight moral restraint lost by edict becoming known. An equal gain from our knowing that we must think of some other way.

5. As just stated in No. 4, there is a slight loss of force due to this cause.

If it were possible to have power and not use it, that would be ideal. As it is not, we must do without it as we do now.

6. I fear that many of us allow children to disturb the order in classrooms too long before we use the power of suspension that rests with us. This is due to fear of being considered weak in discipline.

Result is that before restraint is applied the evil becomes chronic. The child is removed by action of superintendent or parent, or by natural promotion, to some other school. Thus, owing to past immunity, long continued, severe measures are resorted to when, had he been checked in beginning, mild measures would have sufficed.

LEWIS H. TUTHILL, Principal P. S. 16, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. But it would be much better for some pupils, if they knew that the power resided in the principal, or other immediate school authorities.

4. I believe discipline is more difficult, and worse in case of some teachers.

5. Yes, to some extent.

6. We need more efficient means of dealing with incorrigibles. Principals should have some means of requiring presence of parents, when necessary of removing a pupil who is a disturbing element in a class, in the meantime—of enforcing a quick and certain penalty, as a final resort.

CHARLES E. O'NEILL, Principal P. S. 17, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. (a) Punishment might be administered in public. This would have a harmful effect.

- (b) Pupils might be accidentally maimed. This would render the teacher liable to arrest and imprisonment.
 - (c) Girls often lose self-respect after having been whipped.
 - (d) Many parents would consider themselves relieved of all responsibility.
 - (e) A boy might be whipped for something he had not done. This might sour his disposition.
4. I cannot answer this question. Corporal punishment had been abolished before I entered the service.
5. Parents often inform their children that the teachers cannot inflict corporal punishment. Disorderly pupils are apt to take advantage when they know that the teacher's powers are limited.
6. The principal should have the power to compel parents to attend hearings set by the principal.
- The principal should have the power to suspend disorderly pupils until their parents come to school.
- Parents should be punished when they fail to co-operate with the school authorities.

EDWARD BUSH, Principal P. S. 18, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
 2. I am decidedly of the opinion that a wholesome effect is produced upon intractable pupils in our schools by the mere knowledge on their part that corporal punishment may be applied as a last resort.
- With rare exceptions it serves the purpose of correction when nothing else will; and in such cases the deservedness of the punishment is itself an all sufficient reason for its administration. I believe it is so in the eye of the wrong-doer himself.
- I have no desire for its adoption except for the most extreme cases; and these with good sense and good feeling can be very infrequent.
3. The power should be in the hands of the principal only, or some person designated by him. It should be used only in cases of continued insubordination or very serious offences when other means have failed.
 4. Discipline of the school as a whole is no worse. Corporal punishment is necessary for extreme cases.
 5. Yes.

JOHN W. RAFFERTY, Principal P. S. 19, Brooklyn:

1. Yes (boys only).
2. (a) The power to administer corporal punishment *in the home inheres* unquestionably in the parent. At school the principal, in every essential of discipline and training, *takes the place* of the parent. "*In loco parentis*," means something to any person possessed of a logical mind and a sense of the eternal fitness of things.

- (b) In a class of 50 boys the 49 decent pupils have rights that the 1 *outlaw* should be forced to respect.
- (c) In every male school there are always a certain few that can be effectively reached in no other way.
- (d) A knowledge that corporal punishment *may* be resorted to has a mighty deterrent effect.

3. Corporal punishment should be administered, when necessary, by means of a good, strong strap (without *buckle*) applied to the buttock. The *strap* is effective, and leaves no marks or injuries.

If principals cannot be trusted to use their judgment as to when necessary, then for God's sake, and the sake of schools, give them power to punish when the authority of the parent is secured, *in writing*, if necessary. I would be willing to accept that very limited power, and be grateful.

4. Much worse. Many times worse. The people of this city who support the schools do not realize, in spite of the *theorists* on a pedestal, that those schools are being honey-combed daily with every form of gross misconduct and flagrant insubordination.

5. Most certainly I do. I have had boys tell their teachers repeatedly that they would not obey, and no one in the school could make them obey, as no one dared touch them. Some of them have even dared to tell me that. Only last week a boy in my school threw black-board rubbers at his teacher, calling her, in the presence of the class, "a son of a b——," and telling her plainly and loudly that she could "go to h—ll." Does any man living think that the use of corporal punishment in such a case, and on such a boy, would be doing him a wrong?

Another boy told me last term that if I dared to touch *him* he would murder me.

I have been a teacher and principal for more than 25 years. Should not my judgment be taken before that of some faddist with no practical experience?

6. To transfer a boy to another school simply furnishes him, in many cases, a new field for his deviltry. The Children's Court he often regards as a huge joke, as he is frequently told to go back and be a good boy. He has bullied every one and everything in his path. Everybody knows that he is "spoiling" for the only form of punishment that can "reach" him—a good, stingy *strap*. To let a boy of this kind go on in his insubordination and outlawry is a curse to the boy, a crime against the State, and a sin against God.

How long will he be allowed to make a fool of the properly constituted authorities?

MATILDA C. SKENE, Principal P. S. 20, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. It is alike degrading to the one who inflicts and the one who receives. The parents are the ones responsible for the conduct of their children. They

should have the responsibility thrown on their shoulders, where it belongs, and be compelled to inflict whatever punishment is necessary to make their child amenable to authority.

4. My experience, before consolidation, was in the Borough of Manhattan, where corporal punishment was not allowed.

5. No.

6. That the principal have the power to send for the parent and request that the parent inflict adequate punishment for the insubordinate conduct of his child. If the parent refuse to come to the school or to give the proper punishment to the child, that the district superintendent have the power to summon and fine such parents. The amount of fine at the discretion of the district superintendent. If the amount of fine be over five dollars make it a matter for the Children's Court. The district superintendent to fine from ten cents to five dollars. The present conditions, I believe, are due entirely to the shifting of the responsibility of the parents. If *they* were compelled to pay they would see that their child obeyed.

LAURA BLACK, Principal P. S. 22, Brooklyn:

1. No, except when administered by parents.

2. Degrading to pupils.

4. No worse.

5. Yes, where such punishment is resorted to by parents.

6. Urging parents to take more responsibility.

Temporarily suspending pupils.

EVERETT BARNES, Principal P. S. 23, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. (a) To save the boy. To make him understand that *Law* is a rule of conduct which must be obeyed. To show him the immediate results of wrong-doing to the end that uncorrected present evil may not cause habits of thought and action which, later in life, may cause his ruin.

(b) To maintain respect for authority and regard for law and order with the least possible loss of time.

3. Bodily chastisement (to my mind, the most natural punishment for a child), administered by *one* person only, either the principal or some person delegated by him, *with the written consent of parents or guardians*.

4. Worse.

5. Yes:—*that*, more than any other one thing. The knowledge that I had the power to inflict corporal punishment would alone be sufficient to keep the very few bad boys in order. In such case, it would be seldom, if ever, necessary to use it. The knowledge on the part of the children that I have no such power greatly encourages the very few among them who are disobedient

and disorderly and who need summary disciplining. These few (not over one or two per cent.) waste the time and in the long run impair the health of the teacher. They rob the well-behaved children of time which should be devoted to teaching them and retard the school work.

AUGUSTA D. MOORE, Principal P. S. 24, Brooklyn:

1. No (unless greatly restricted).

2. I fear abuse of power. An obedience that comes from right motive is preferable to that which comes through fear. In exceptional cases, where parents request and advise corporal punishment, when all other methods of discipline have failed, its administration probably would be beneficial to culprit and school discipline.

All bad boys are not mentally or physically deficient. Many are not only normal, but are strong specimens of humanity.

4. I think fully as good. The spirit of the school better, but much more time has to be devoted to matters of discipline. One has constantly to crush the little sins, to build up and keep up the moral tone. The selection of capable teachers for boys' classes has had much to do with the maintenance of good discipline. Efficient boys' teachers are worthy of greater remuneration than a bonus of \$40.

5. Yes, to some extent. We have had imaginative and untruthful children, girls as well as boys, go home and accuse gentle, conscientious teachers of shaking or abusing them. After rigid investigations I have usually found such statements to be false, and pupils have in presence of parents invariably acknowledged that facts stated at home were untrue.

"What the teacher must not do" is too frequently discussed in the home and in the newspaper.

6. The establishment in each school of an ungraded class for care of exceedingly troublesome boys. The teacher of said class to be an expert in moral and intellectual training. The school day for such pupils might be extended to four o'clock and a merit system for discharge to regular grades be introduced. Almost every school has a few teachers wonderfully successful in managing and inspiring troublesome boys. One of these could be assigned to such a class, but he or she should receive higher compensation than a regular grade teacher.

F. W. MAR, Principal P. S. 25, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. A principal should be given as free a hand as possible in the administration of his school and should be held responsible for the result.

The fact that restrictions in the manner of punishment are placed upon the teacher is known to the pupils. The ideal that a pupil looks up to in a teacher is that of a strong friend, kind but just and able to punish as well as to forgive.

The actual power of the class teacher is limited to a detention of 30 minutes after school as a punishment and if she appeals to the office there is little left except the final penalty of suspension, which is equivalent to confession of failure. A teacher without power to punish is a source of mirth or of pity to the pupil; a teacher who is able to punish and refrains is a friend to be respected. Therefore while I think that corporal punishment should be rarely inflicted I do believe that some one in the school should be authorized to inflict it in extreme cases and the pupils should know that he has that power.

3. I think that the principal of the school should have the right, after he is satisfied that all possible measures of a milder nature have been tried, to sentence the child to a whipping. I have definite opinions as to how he should arrive at this conclusion but also think that each principal should be free to exercise his best judgment.

5. I do.

FRANK K. PERKINS, Principal P. S. 26, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. There are children who, on account of age, inherited tendencies and home surroundings, cannot be made in any other way to understand that the law must be promptly and unquestioningly obeyed.

It is maudlin sentimentality to hold a *whole* class up while the teacher devotes her time to *one* unruly pupil. Moral suasion should be used at all times, but there is a time when a boy should realize there is force behind law. Often the opponents to corporal punishment are those who are mere theorists, or those who are too cowardly to express their honest convictions.

3. I would leave it to the discretion of the principal. If the principal is not a person of good judgment, get another principal.

4. Worse in the primary department and the fifth year of the grammar department.

5. Yes. It was a very infrequent event in this school to have a boy whipped; but the knowledge on the part of the boys that, as a last resort, punishment by rattan could and would be inflicted had a deterrent effect to continued defiance of order.

It does not seem to be generally understood that the schools at present are in an *exceptionally* weak position in regard to power to maintain discipline. At the home there may be corporal punishment, isolation, deprivations of various kinds, inflicted; in the streets obedience to the law is compelled by the police; in the schools we are practically limited to moral suasion, or to the slow, unsatisfactory, burden-shifting expedient of suspension.

The majority of troublesome boys, including the innumerable ones who are not suspended, do not suffer from adenoid growths or other physical defects.

6. As a general rule, I do not believe in the practice of whipping boys of twelve years of age or older. I believe there should be a separate school in every school district especially adapted for pupils of this age who are not

amenable to ordinary school discipline. These schools should have shops, gymnasiums, etc. They should be under the management of competent men teachers. The means of punishment should be left to expert principals. Many a boy is a bad boy, in the school meaning, because the school does not meet his needs of expression and development through manual work.

EDWIN B. ULINE, Principal P. S. 27, Brooklyn:

1. *Yes!*

2. Appeal to reason, moral suasion and present forms of punishment are inadequate to correct or restrain the hardened offender. Flagrant offenses, unaccompanied by vigorous punishment, tend to cheapen and weaken authority. This increasing disregard for authority among New York children should be checked in our schools. I believe conditions may arise in all schools when this can be accomplished only by the presence of the rod—active or potential.

3. Hard and fast rules absurd. Discretion should rest with the principal. Of course there should be physical force, not violence; pain, not injury; displeasure, not anger or revenge; a consultation with parents if possible; the avoidance of the rod till all other means have been tried, and so on.

Open rebellion, resistance, disobedience, brutality on the playground, persistence in profane or obscene language—pronounced manifestations of disrespect to teachers or principals on the street—these are some of the conditions sometimes calling for the application of the rod.

4. Discipline is weak—*i. e.*, by no means what it ought and can be. I was not in New York before the abolition of corporal punishment.

5. *Yes*—in many instances.

M. C. DONOHUE, Principal P. S. 28, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. It would degrade the one who inflicted it and the child who received it.

4. I was not in the system during the time corporal punishment was permitted, so cannot state.

5. No.

M. J. MERRITT, Principal P. S. 29, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. I consider it demoralizing, blunting the moral sensibilities of children, and weakening the influence of teachers.

4. Better.

5. I do not. The present agitation of the subject might naturally have this effect.

THOS. D. MURPHY, Principal P. S. 30, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. The *knowledge* that there is no authority in the hands of the principal to chastise refractory pupils is a detriment to the discipline.
Yesterday a boy told me to "Go to hell." This could not have happened under our old method of discipline.
- I am a family man. I have nine (9) children. I find it necessary to spank occasionally.
3. I believe corporal punishment should be administered by the principal of the school on the rump (mother nature's cushion) with a small rawhide.
4. I find the boys are becoming more incorrigible every year.
5. I most certainly do.
6. I do not know of anything as effective as corporal punishment in the public schools.

ALMERON W. SMITH, Principal P. S. 32, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. I believe in corporal punishment as a *last resort* for disorderly and incorrigible boys only. My reasons are:
 - (a) It visits upon the offender the punishment, and in a manner that appeals most strongly to him upon failure of all other appeals.
 - (b) Parents are frequently incapable or indifferent, and thus may not render effective assistance, so that without corporal punishment the boy must be sent to an institution for his detention, an undesirable alternative.
 - (c) The possibility of its infliction has a deterrent effect.
3. Punishment with a strap of leather not less than $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches wide, inflicted only by the principal of the school.
It should not be inflicted until other means of appeal have been ineffectively made.
4. My service has been only since its abolition.
5. Yes. A speedy and sure infliction of penalty for serious infractions of good order by competent authority on the ground is a strong influence for the maintenance of proper respect and order.

CAROLINE R. GIPNER, Principal P. S. 33, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. A small percentage of pupils, because of the lack of proper home influences, are undisciplined and lawless. Punishments such as can be imposed in school do not act as a deterrent to these children. They do not care about loss of marks, nor detention after three o'clock. Suspension has no terrors, as it usually means trial in another school. For such pupils, who defy those in authority, whose conduct has an evil influence on the other members

of the class, who are the cause of making the work in the classroom less efficient because of the teachers' time and attention given to them, corporal punishment should be permitted; however, only as a last resort when all other means have failed.

3. No form of punishment should be prescribed, that to be left to the judgment of the person who has authority to administer it; with an understanding that no punishment is to be inflicted that may cause physical injury to the pupil.

In my opinion the principal only should have the power to administer corporal punishment, and should be held strictly accountable for any abuse of that power.

4. I can not reply to this question, as previous to my appointment as principal I was a teacher in the Borough of Manhattan, where corporal punishment was prohibited.

5. Yes, in the case of some pupils.

JAMES T. CAREY, Principal P. S. 34, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. I consider corporal punishment as degrading the teacher and brutalizing the pupil.

4. Worse.

5. To some extent.

6. I consider truancy directly and indirectly the cause of much of the trouble we experience in school. Attack this by holding parents responsible—financially. While this would not cure all, it would alleviate many of our troubles.

ALFRED E. IVES, Principal P. S. 35, Brooklyn:

1. No.

4. Worse in some respects.

5. To a certain extent, yes.

6. I believe pupils unwilling to obey rules and regulations should be separated from the rest. I like the plan adopted in the city of Philadelphia.

JOSEPH A. HANIPHY, Principal P. S. 37, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. (a) For the moral training of that very small portion of pupils whom it is impossible to reach in any other way.

(b) To deter by this punishment any exhibition of brutal hereditary passion by a misguided child.

(c) To save from Children's Courts, etc., pupils whom this simple punishment would correct.

3. Corporal punishment should be inflicted by the principal only. The matter should be supervised by the Board of Superintendents. A record should be kept by the principal of the cases when corporal punishment was necessary. I am not prepared to say at present what form would be desirable.

4. I came from the Manhattan schools to Brooklyn in 1904. Corporal punishment was abolished by By-Law in Manhattan in the sixties. I think it was, however, carried on *sub rosa*. Here's another phase—pupils know that the teacher has no legal right to slap or hit. She does it, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred "gets away with it." This is or was an actual condition in Manhattan, and is to some extent the same all over to-day. I leave it to the Committee to judge what kind of training this is for pupils. It certainly does not teach respect for law.

5. In aggravated cases, yes. That man must lack common judgment who does not know that in a great city there are some children who, from heredity, environment, criminal aptitude, ordinary "badness," need physical force to keep them straight. If there is one boy of this kind in a class of 40 possessing the knowledge that no one can touch him, his opportunities for vicious work can only be described as appalling. He can (1) make the teacher a nervous wreck; (2) infect the class, and warm into life any similar quality among his mates.

6. Some form of punishment should be devised. We are "weak" when it comes to handling these exceptional cases. In the interest of the rising generation we must labor to establish "law and order." If the boys who are to be the criminals of the next generation begin proceedings at an early age by crushing ruthlessly those who represent society and authority, is any sensible man who knows conditions surprised at the natural harvest that must follow?

MARY McSWYNY, Principal P. S. 39, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. Danger of abuse of privilege if placed in hands of teachers; apt to be considered remedy for all complaints.

Better feeling between teachers and children where corporal punishment is not permitted.

Cringing or hardened dispositions often result from its use.

When privilege of whipping is withheld, teachers are more apt to study dispositions of children in order to find suitable punishment for wrong-doing—hence better discipline.

4. I have had no experience in schools where such punishment was resorted to.

5. Yes; when the conduct of teachers toward pupils, and the rights of children are made the subjects of discussion in the columns of the daily press, children get an exaggerated idea of their importance; this results in unruly conduct in school, particularly in districts where the home training does not counterbalance the influence of what has been read or discussed.

6. Principals should have full right of suspension for unruly conduct. They should be permitted to suspend until such time as the parents would show their willingness to co-operate with principal and teachers in the discipline of the pupil. They should have the right to suspend again and again the boy who is persistently troublesome. When the parents are bothered they will be likely to find means to make the child behave.

ALEC G. McALLISTER, Principal P. S. 40, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. I have been a principal thirty-five years. The first eight I used the rod. Then I decided to try doing without it. The results were so gratifying that I never used it again.

4. Better.

5. On the whole, no. There are always a few physical cowards who behave better through fear of the rod, but more than ninety-eight per cent. of the pupils are both orderly and respectful.

I believe they are all proud that in their school such a thing as corporal punishment is never thought of.

6. I have no suggestions to make. So far I have been able to control all situations with the means now provided.

WM. C. ALLEN, Principal P. S. 41, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Knowledge of fact that principal has the power is generally sufficient for chronic offenders.

(b) Present methods of punishment are ineffective.

3. Power to inflict corporal punishment should be given to the principal, but not to the class teacher.

5. Yes.

ELIZABETH F. DOHERTY, Principal P. S. 42, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. The troublesome pupils in a class are seldom more than four or five—rarely that. Their persistence in wrong-doing is almost invariably due to the knowledge that no punishment can be inflicted. They are cowards and can only be reached through physical pain.

It is my sincere belief that, if this class of pupils were subdued, at least 40 per cent. more work could be done, while the benefit accruing to the weak-minded children who are easily led astray would be almost incalculable.

3. A whipping with a small strap or switch on the lower portion of the body, or on the palms of the hands with a flat stick similar to a ruler.

These apply only to boys below twelve years of age, never to boys older than that, and I have never thought or found it necessary to punish girls other than by detention.

4. Corporal punishment has never been in use in the schools since my connection with them (previous to January, 1903, I taught in Manhattan). From conversations with various teachers, I judge that it is worse, especially among younger children.

5. I *know* that it does—having frequently heard pupils urge others to do wrong because “she can’t touch you.”

Parents have frequently brought refractory children in from other schools (parochial), because they (the children) wanted to come to the public schools so that they could not be punished.

6. In the cases of the *older* children, those from eleven to twelve years of age up, I suggest that after reasonable efforts to correct the pupil have failed the *principal* have the power to suspend the pupil for a limited time, thus throwing the responsibility on the parents, who are, in most cases, unwilling to shoulder it.

JAMES A. O'DONNELL, Principal F. S. 43, Brooklyn:

1. Yes; but limited as stated below.

2. In a case of wilful perversity, by an otherwise *perfectly normal* pupil, where all other methods and resources have failed, something must be done. Though I am most emphatically opposed to inflicting pain or discomfort on any creature, yet if a *little* pain *now* will aid to reform the character of the pupil and thus prevent his greater physical, mental and moral suffering in the future, the child is virtually receiving the benefit of a lesser evil by the present infliction of some deterrent and reformatory means.

The rights of the great majority of the law-abiding pupils must be conserved also. A wilfully disobedient pupil, who respects neither law nor teacher, frequently has a pernicious influence on other pupils.

3. The principal should have power to summon the parent (father preferred), and to regulate or stipulate the quality and quantity. In some cases, where parental supervision and control are lacking, the principal should have the direct power. No one should be present, except the principal, the parent if possible, and perhaps the teacher.

4. I am unable to answer this question from personal knowledge, as I was never a principal or teacher where corporal punishment was allowed.

5. Yes, with a few pupils.

6. In the case of any pupil, where the cause of misconduct is a pathological one, an expert should be detailed to school districts to thoroughly examine and diagnose each case. This should be done in the presence and with the active co-operation of the principal and parent. Card records should be kept by principal, parent and teacher, with progressively increasing data. Medical treatment and expert experienced instructors should work together to restore

all physical and mental functions to the normal average standard. Physique, hereditary, environment, all should be carefully considered and the apparent remedies applied.

THOMAS O. BAKER, Principal P. S. 44, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Every principal should *possess* the *power* of *enforcing* obedience. Laws without penalties would be useless. Penalties not enforced are useless. The principals to-day can make *laws* to govern their schools, but cannot enforce them.

The fact that corporal punishment could be inflicted would in itself act as a deterrent.

3. The principal should have the power to inflict punishment, *i. e.*, corporal. It should not be granted the teacher. It should be the last *resort*.

The forms might differ. The ruler applied to the palm of the hand is no doubt the most satisfactory.

4. I find *boys* repeat offenses and have to be corrected oftener. While I am a *firm* believer in the "rod," it was seldom necessary for me to use it.

5. I *do*. I want my boys to know that I can enforce obedience. I want them to know also that it (corporal punishment) will never be resorted to unless all other means fail. When I have *used* the rod I never allowed the boy to leave my presence until I had convinced him that his punishment was merited, that I administered because it was necessary, and that it *was* as painful to me to administer it as for him to receive it. In this way the boy left me without the feeling of hatred that might otherwise exist.

Permit me to say that for twenty years I had the right to *whip*. In that time I doubt if I administered corporal punishment to forty boys.

I *do not want* to thrash a *boy*. I want the *boy* to know that I *can*, and if *he* insists on disobedience that I *will*, and that it will be done *properly*.

P. J. BEHAN, Principal P. S. 45, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Past experience in the schools of Brooklyn, in which the discipline was excellent.

3. The rattan, used only by the principal, after consultation with the parents.

4. Worse.

5. Yes.

M. LOUISE ROCKWOOD, Principal P. S. 46, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Children are defiant where there is no corporal punishment. I believe in giving the power to the executive head only.

3. A thin rattan.

4. Discipline no worse; but much harder to maintain.

5. Most decidedly, yes.

LIBBIE J. EGINTON, Principal P. S. 47, Brooklyn:

1. No.
5. I think it detrimental for children to know that no corporal punishment can be inflicted.

MARGARET S. WINSLOW, Principal P. S. 48, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. (a) There are but three kinds of appeals which can be made to a child in the cause of law and obedience—an appeal to his moral nature, an appeal to his intellectual, and to his physical natures.
There are pupils in our schools to whom the first two appeals mean nothing. This is due to lack of moral development or to degeneracy. It is better, in my opinion, to use judiciously the one appeal to which these pupils will respond than to allow them to become habitual law-breakers and scorners of the law.
(b) If corporal punishment is permitted in the schools there will be fewer appeals to brutal parents to do badly what the school authorities are better fitted to do.
3. Punishment with a ruler upon the hands. To be administered by the principal only when all other appeals have been made and have been shown to fail.
4. Worse.
5. Yes, in some schools where the rougher element attend.

ANNA A. SHORT, Principal P. S. 51, Brooklyn:

1. No, except in cases of persistent disobedience or incorrigibility.
2. The present methods of discipline are effective for the great majority of our pupils. Many parents would be apt to throw the whole burden of disciplining the pupils on the school if the rod were restored.
4. Having had no experience in Brooklyn before consolidation I do not feel that I can answer this question.
5. Most firmly. In my opinion this is the keynote to the whole situation.
6. Detention at the noon hour for the greater number of disorderly pupils.
For the persistently disobedient or incorrigible pupils, I beg leave to suggest the establishment of special schools in each district—the transfer of the pupils to the special schools to be made by the order of the district superintendent. In these schools the principals ought to be allowed great flexibility in disciplining the pupils committed to their care.

E. J. BLACK, Principal P. S. 52, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. Because there are so many ways of managing a child without it, and if such punishment is necessary I think the parents of child should attend to the matter.

4. The discipline is about the same. No. 52 is a primary school.

5. A child must respect the rights of others. I know that even one persistently disorderly boy interferes very seriously with the progress of his schoolmates, besides using the energy of his teacher upon himself and so preventing her best work with the class as a whole.

In such a case, I really think that the knowledge that corporal punishment could be inflicted would act as a deterrent.

LIZZIE I. DOWLING, Principal P. S. 54, Brooklyn:

1. If corporal punishment may be interpreted as laying of hands on pupils, *yes*; if it means using the rod, *no*.

2. (a) It is degrading to both instructor and pupil.

(b) It would be likely to involve the person inflicting the punishment in serious trouble, as he might cause injury to the person punished.

(c) It would increase the tendency to play truant.

3. There are times, when, on account of disobedience, defiance or some other cause, a pupil *must* get out of his room. If he refuses to do this, it may be necessary to put him out by force, and as a result his person may show marks of some kind. This might be considered corporal punishment, but would be absolutely necessary to maintain order.

4. Never had corporal punishment in my school time, either as pupil or instructor.

5. Yes; not only on the part of the pupil, but more so on the part of the parents, who come to school often on the slightest provocation. These parents inform their children that the teacher has no authority whatever to touch them. This has a tendency to cause disrespect for the teacher and thereby weaken his discipline.

ROBERT J. FROST, Principal P. S. 55, Brooklyn:

1. I do not favor any *formal* mode of corporal punishment.

2. Against.

(a) Pupils who must be flogged to give obedience are seldom if ever cured of their bad disposition.

(b) Such punishment, even though deserved, reverses conditions by destroying the sympathy of the class at large for the teacher, and creating a sort of morbid sympathy for the culprit.

(c) Where corporal punishment is necessary to get obedience, it is apt to be carried to excess.

(d) It is lowering to the dignity of the teacher and has a decidedly bad influence on the tone of the school.

3. While my answer to No. 1 is "No," I feel that something should be done to amend the present rule so that a teacher who gives a pupil a little slap or clip in the ear as a reminder that he is deviating from the right path need not be in fear and trembling lest charges be made against him or her.

The most exemplary parents use the *slap* and *clip* referred to, but the instant the *teacher* resorts to these measures the tables are turned, and the offending pupil becomes the accuser, and the teacher the offender.

4. I am not in a position to judge, as during all my experience corporal punishment has been prohibited.

From all I hear, however, the abolition of corporal punishment has put into the hands of the impudent pupil a weapon that gives much trouble to the teacher.

5. I do. In bygone days a disorderly pupil might be expelled—there being no Compulsory Education Law in those times; nor were the school district lines as rigid as they are at present—and with all these advantages in the past, corporal punishment was permitted.

At the present day an impudent and disorderly pupil must be kept, regardless of his defiant attitude, unless the principal wishes to go to the extent of suspension and trial of the pupil. Such suspension calls for a vast expenditure of time and energy which, naturally, is given at the cost of the law-abiding pupils of the school.

6. In my opinion the present By-Law should be amended so as to read "*brutal* corporal punishment." In other words the administering of a little slap should not necessarily hold the teacher up to odium and constitute grounds for charges against the teacher.

Let the term "*brutal* corporal punishment" cover a case where some mark or bruise or injury results, so that conditions that exist at the present day where a pupil may be simply touched by the teacher, may not bring out the oft-repeated retort from the pupil "You'll pay for this" or "I'll go to the Board of Education and complain about you."

Give the principal of each school more discretion, and let the law be as elastic as our course of study—made to suit the district, the parents, the teacher and the pupils. Or give permission to administer corporal punishment on the written request or acquiescence of the parent. Many parents of refractories are most willing to leave the matter in the principal's hands where the principal has the confidence of his little community.

WINIFRED T. CULLEN, Principal P. S. 56, Brooklyn:

1. No, not in my school.
2. I do not need to resort to it. I can obtain order and respect without it.
3. No *man* or even woman *teacher* should administer it. If corporal punishment is needed, the child's parent is the only person who should inflict it.
4. I, personally, find discipline good all the time.
5. It may do in some schools. I do not think it interferes in Public School 56.
6. Each offence should suggest its own punishment. A tardy boy should be detained from play after 3 P. M. A boy who breaks a window or injures

school or personal property should pay for it out of his own earnings. A boy who *runs* down stairs should be sent up and down several times slowly.

N. B.—Much depends upon the *tone* and *spirit* of school. If that be what it should, the pupils will fall in line and obey and respect the authority.

Constant vigilance is the price of *success*.

ELENORE E. ELLIOTT, Principal P. S. 57, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. The parents in my judgment are the proper ones to administer it, and should be made responsible for lawlessness in their children.

4. Not quite as good; teachers have to be very tactful.

5. Not with the smaller children. With the larger ones yes, if the parents are not in sympathy with the teacher.

6. Parents should be made responsible for impertinence, lawlessness and deliberate disobedience to rational and necessary methods of government, viz.: First offense, a small fine; second offense, a larger one, and so on until the parents and children realize that obedience to law and order is imperative.

IDA L. MORRISON, Principal P. S. 62, Brooklyn:

1. No.

4. It is equally good.

5. In some cases.

HONOR E. QUINN, Principal P. S. 63, Brooklyn:

1. No

2. "Corporal punishment is degrading, humiliating and brutal."

Win the boys through love, kindness, sympathy, and interest combined. Use tact. Win a boy's confidence.

4. Better.

5. No.

F. A. WILLARD, Principal P. S. 64, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. It prevents the endless repetition of offences which waste the time of teachers and pupil. It settles a multitude of cases which, with even the greatest care and discretion by present methods, produce serious irritation between teacher and class and between school and parent.

It makes adequate punishment a certainty, and destroys the sense of immunity which vicious and unruly pupils now feel.

It would place under more effectual restraint thousands of unfortunate children whose lives are affected by no good influence except that of the teacher and the school.

Punishment in school as a rule is milder and more consistent than that administered at home.

3. The rod. Punishment of this kind in the province of the principal at such time and place as in his judgment will be most effective.

4. Worse, and very much more difficult to maintain.

5. *Yes*. There are many cases of open defiance, with the statement that teachers are powerless to do anything in the matter. I believe that most disobedient and insubordinate pupils presume directly upon this fact, hoping if the case goes to the parent, by falsehood, by accusing the "other fellow," or by diverting the message, to delay or prevent punishment.

I find that boys who leave school uncured of their vicious tendencies continue in lawless ways until checked by the intervention of legal authority. The number of cases of boys in school on parole from the court suggests the gravity of the situation.

HARRIET L. BOGUE, Principal P. S. 65, Brooklyn:

1. No and yes.

2. No. Discipline gained by *fear* is not *true* discipline.

3. Yes. The rattan, as a last expedient in wilful disobedience and in the parent's presence.

4. The discipline requires more time and patience, but when gained without corporal punishment is more *lasting*. And a *happier* and *freer spirit* pervades the school.

5. There are some who boast of no one daring to strike them. Such a pupil or pupils should be made to *feel* that the rattan can be used. I do not think the *mass* of children are influenced by the restriction of corporal punishment. My experience has been that my pupils are more *truthful* and more *confidential* and have greater *respect* for me than when I inflicted corporal punishment. It seems to me, after several years' observation and study of children, that most of their wrong-doings come from "some physical trouble."

6. If in every district a school could be established for bad, unruly, immoral boys, our classrooms would soon become an educational centre. When a teacher enters her room full of the true spirit of the teacher, her work well prepared, and class full of interest and anxious to do good work, and some "bad boy" attempts to disturb the order, has no interest in any work in the class, only as far as he can satisfy his own "bad ends," then, I think, such a child should be placed in a school where he can receive individual attention and strict training. If we had such a school with long, busy hours of work and games, and each boy was watched as to his *morals* and *physical* condition, I think *our* schools would be greatly benefited, and the boys in the "district school" trained to become better citizens. The great fault with our pupils is a lack of proper HOME training.

EMILY C. POWERS, Principal P. S. 67, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. (a) It would be a retrograde movement.
(b) It is barbarous.
4. I never used corporal punishment, even when it was allowable.
5. I believe the above is true in what is known as the better sections of our city.
6. I believe that no hard and fast law can be formulated. Each case is so different that it requires thought and care to cope with it.

F. A. IRVINE, Principal P. S. 68, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. Its brutalizing effects. Where it might do good in a few cases, its general effect is lowering.
4. About the same; always will be some bad cases.
5. Very much, in certain *bad* cases.
6. Anything that will make parents realize their responsibilities will be of service; for as a rule the pupils causing most trouble are those of weak parents.

MARGARET J. MCCOOEY, Principal P. S. 69, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. I think the abuse of the privilege would do more harm than good.
4. About the same.
5. I believe that the fact that corporal punishment cannot be inflicted is published broadcast, interferes with good discipline or, I might say, makes it more difficult to get good discipline.
6. I believe children should be made to pay for the destruction of school property or property of fellow pupils. When a child wilfully destroys a book or paper, breaks glass or scratches a desk, he should be compelled to pay for the repairing of the property.

MARTHA S. McLAUGHLIN, Principal P. S. 71, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. The knowledge that the rod could be used would make the authority of the principal respected by the incorrigible boys.
3. The rod is probably the most convenient means and the conditions will vary with the occasion calling for its use.
4. It is harder to make boys industrious and teachers are forced to endure words and actions from incorrigible boys.
5. It has that tendency. In every boys' class there are about two boys who do not respect authority unless they know there is power to enforce it.
6. Report says that other forms of punishment are used in schools, but their effect does not seem to warrant their continuance, hence I have no suggestion to make.

GEORGE M. DAVISON, Principal P. S. 72, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. The schools are not penal institutions. Their character as places of learning should be maintained. The pupils who will not yield to ordinary methods and reasonable patience should be segregated and cared for as other defectives are.

4. I am not familiar with the conditions under corporal punishment.

5. I do. If my superiors cannot trust me, my subordinates feel less respect for me. I should be given the advantage that comes from voluntary abstinence from corporal punishment.

6. When corporal punishment was abolished, inadequate provision was made for filling its place. The truant schools do not help me with the incorrigible boy whose parents cannot control him. I have not been relieved by the special schools of a single case of discipline, although stabbing and stealing are the crimes which have gone unpunished here. Suspension gives the boy a holiday and is rarely regarded as serious punishment.

Provide schools for incorrigible children. Equip them with the best disciplinarians of our present elementary corps. Pay these teachers the same as high school teachers. Require the elementary schools to send to these places their unreasonably incorrigible. Make this requirement so stringent that it will not be a confession of weakness to sentence pupils to these schools.

W. T. B. S. IMLAY, Principal P. S. 73, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Many of the pupils do not respect authority and only obey through fear of punishment. They do not care for parental reproof or being sent home. If the power to inflict corporal punishment existed the knowledge would deter many who would otherwise become law-breakers. The necessity of enforcing the laws of restraint does not always exist, but the knowledge of the existence of these laws prevents many from becoming criminals.

3. Whipping by the principal at such times and places as his judgment suggests.

4. I do. I have had more trouble with discipline and truancy.

5. It does to a great degree.

WILLIAM S. MILLS, Principal P. S. 75, Brooklyn:

1. Yes, administered with prudence, and only after all other means of correction have failed.

2. Though they are comparatively rare, there are vicious and defiant pupils, whose school education must begin with obedience, for whose wrong conduct instant remedy is needed until the moral lessons shall have developed.

Sending for parents (who are often unable or unwilling to respond), or sending boys to other classrooms, is only temporizing, a shifting of responsibility, and is not effectual.

The scores of idle degenerates standing on our street corners are products of ineffectual school discipline.

3. Corporal punishment should be administered only on the written authority of the father. Such punishment should cause temporary physical discomfort. A switch applied to the fleshy part of the body would be effectual. Parents who are not willing to trust the principal with this power should be compelled to take their children from school, until they can guarantee obedience.

I would administer such punishment always in the presence of a third person—a teacher or the parent.

The authority to administer punishment should be vested in the principal only.

4. Worse. It has deteriorated. Principals are now unable to co-operate with parents of boys disposed to wilful disobedience. These boys are usually strong-willed and have the spirit of leadership in the class. The present conditions encourage this, and their influence is strong for evil. Some of them doubtless have physical defects that aggravate the tendency to wrong conduct. Such, obviously, ought not to be punished. But others there are who have vigorous health, which emboldens them to bullyism and defiance of authority. They are possessed of faculties which should be set at work in the right direction.

Deterrent punishment at the proper time would accomplish this.

5. Yes. If the right to punish were restored, only a small percentage of those disposed to disobedience would require punishment.

Pupils do not hesitate to inform their instructors that the power to punish is denied.

This spirit is a distinct temptation to yield to evil inclination. The knowledge that it is not safe to do wrong would often save a child who will later learn higher motives for right conduct.

Punishment should be preventive and remedial, and not vindictive.

Corporal punishment, wisely applied, is not inconsistent with love for children.

A. A. ASHMUN, Principal P. S. 76, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Among children, as well as older people, there are many whose moral nature is of a low type. Their home training is not such as to tend to its development. This class of pupils must be first reached through a sense of bodily pain. After they have been brought to the knowledge that there is a master, a respect of law, order and rights of others can be cultivated.

Another class of pupils who sometimes need corporal punishment is the lazy child who is averse to any mental exertion if it can possibly be avoided. These

after once being started are apt to become interested and make good students. Left to themselves they would drag along through their school life and finally leave school without having completed half their work.

3. Use the rod, not brutally, but persuasively, and let it be applied by the principal.

4. Worse.

5. Yes.

CHANNING STEBBINS, Principal P. S. 77, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Some children can be controlled in no other way.

3. The law of New York in substance says reasonable corporal punishment shall not be considered an offense on the part of the teacher who inflicts it. Let the Board of Education say "Principals alone shall have power to inflict corporal punishment." Let the courts determine whether the punishment has been unusual.

4. Worse.

5. Yes. Greatly and conversely the knowledge that corporal punishment may be inflicted aids in maintaining the proper order and respect. Incidentally, I would remark that if a principal does not believe in corporal punishment he is not obliged to inflict it, and he shouldn't be greatly concerned if other principals punish in that way. Many principals who are opposed to corporal punishment are inconsistent enough to suggest to parents that their children need it, and indirectly are the cause of a great deal of corporal punishment.

HENNING W. PRENTIS, Principal P. S. 78, Brooklyn:

1. Yes, under certain clear restrictions.

2. The Scripture saith, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," or paraphrased: Respect for law, obedience to authority, is the basis of good citizenship, of efficient control of society, of the family, of the school. Orderly self-control, decent manhood and womanhood must be rooted upon law and justice—moral and civil.

There must be a penal sanction behind every law or rule. In our school we have moral suasion but no penalty save suspension of young children, who are frequently forced to associate with young criminals.

3. (a) For boys only.

(b) By the principal or assistant to principal only.

(c) After full investigation and warning and upon the written consent of the parent.

(e) In the presence of a third party.

(f) Date, character of offense, teacher, etc., recorded.

(g) No slapping, striking or beating upon head or hands, but with a light rattan upon the fleshy parts of the body between waist and knee.

4. Worse, in the case of the boys*particularly.

5. Undoubtedly, yes. The constant affirmation and reaffirmation of the fact by the daily press that the principals and teachers have no right to punish corporally any child, no matter how heinous the offense to manners or morals, has led to practical defiance in many cases of all rules of decency, respect and order.

There is no power in the hands of the principal to enforce ordinary common-sense obedience save by constant appeals to *punishment* by the parent, which is often much more brutal than any school punishment.

6. I believe in patience and moral suasion to the limit with erring children, but when defiance and rebellion against reasonable rules arise moral suasion and gentle methods fail.

Some men and women, as well as nations, cannot be controlled save by police, sheriffs, armies and battleships.

Surely, then, some reasonable punishment—corporal punishment—for children is not necessarily brutal; it is a necessity in the average family.

Repression is external; discipline is internal; but in some cases stern repression is necessary before discipline can begin.

MARY A. MASON, Principal P. S. 79, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. Interpreting No. 1 as meaning "Do you favor the *restoration* of corporal punishment," I answered "No." It seems to me, however, that the best good of *all* the pupils has not been conserved by the abolition of corporal punishment. A disproportionate amount of the time and energy of both teachers and supervisors is taken up by a very few pupils whom corporal punishment, or the fear of it, would have restrained to a great degree.

4. Not apparently worse, perhaps, as regards the appearance of good order; but the strain on the teacher is far greater, and the well-behaved pupils are largely the losers because of the time consumed with incorrigible pupils.

5. Yes. This is the most unfortunate result of the abolition of corporal punishment. The knowledge of the limits of the authority of both teachers and principals serves to encourage in lawlessness a few pupils who are inclined to be disrespectful toward those in authority and regardless of the rights of their fellows.

6. The answers to Nos. 1 and 2 may appear inconsistent; but my position is that since corporal punishment has been abolished it would not be wise to return to it now. However, there has been no adequate substitute provided. I suggest that one school be organized in each school district to which incorrigible pupils may be sent. One small school would relieve hundreds of teachers of the strain of discipline, and make it possible to give better instruction to thousands of pupils.

MOSES YEATON, Principal P. S. 80, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Lawlessness prevails. Children say things to their teachers that are not fit to be written on this paper. A continual run of disorder, impudence and laziness is allowed. Truancy and lateness are rampant. Much of this could be checked and possibly hindered by corporal punishment.

3. The rattan. If the principal has the *authority*, and the children know it, half the battle is won. Have the principal administer it. He is supposed to have judgment enough not to abuse a child.

4. Worse.

5. I do so believe.

JOHN S. FITZPATRICK, Teacher in charge, P. S. 81, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Teaching in the city schools would be easy but for the discipline. I believe it would restore respect.

There are but a few cases in each class that require corporal punishment. Most of the parents in said cases request whipping. These same pupils receive too much attention and the rest of the class suffer.

How may we handle a disturber who refuses to vacate the premises? It is very common for city boys to curse at the teacher in an undertone. Many boys let few remarks of rebuke pass unanswered.

3. Whipping with a piece of rubber hose.

Only as a last resort for second or third offense.

Always in private.

All cases should be reported to the superintendent with cause and number of times previous.

4. Discipline is harder to get to-day. To obtain it takes too much time and energy. Nagging is the principal method to-day. It is worse than whipping, morally. Not only the guilty and the teacher lose, but the innocent who have to listen to a war of words.

5. Yes. Pupils boast of the fact. They defy teachers to strike them.

In some instances children have reported that they were punished when not. They resort to falsehood for protection by shifting the responsibility. The teacher for a time becomes the defendant.

Boys defy the police for the same reasons. In cases of arrest the parents only are punished, and they have little control or influence over the children. Boys soon learn that all the punishment they receive is a threat.

6. Transfers, etc., only add to the victories already won by the boy. We acknowledge to him that we cannot conquer and must hand the task over to another.

Suspensions are a welcome vacation.

What we need are trade schools in each district to which these boys may be sent. Some subjects are difficult and distasteful to them and they need oc

cupation at all times. Most of the disorder comes through lack of interest. I believe it is criminal to try and make a boy try to overcome lack of mental development quickly.

Personally I believe that a By-Law allowing corporal punishment on the written recommendation of the parent would answer.

M. F. VALLETTE, Principal P. S. 82, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. When I say "Yes," it is understood to mean only as a last resort and then administered in a proper manner. In some cases it should never be resorted to. There is a certain class of boys to whom the knowledge that the rod *can* be used will be all sufficient to keep them in order. Some need "winding up" periodically.

3. In case of persistent disorder, impudence and continued neglect of duty. Three taps on the hand and no more.

4. Very much worse.

5. Experience has shown this beyond question.

6. What forms of *punishment* will be regarded as beneficial by the sentimental layman?

Corporal punishment should be a *last resort*. It should be administered by the principal, in a calm state of mind, and after explaining to the victim the *reason* for the punishment; otherwise it will awaken resentment, and the true end of punishment will be lost.

SAUL BADANES, Principal P. S. 84, B., Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. (a) It is below the dignity of the principal to be the whipping master of the school.

(b) In the hands of the principal it is not an immediate influence upon the pupil in the classroom.

(c) It would only be used upon children of poor and ignorant parents, since the well-to-do can always invoke the aid of the State laws against the whipping master.

5. In some instances it does.

6. (a) Principals should have the right to suspend pupils without a hearing before the superintendent.

(b) The professional standing of the principal in the eyes of the superintendent should not be lowered by the number of cases suspended from school.

(c) Principals should have the right to demote pupils without a hearing before the superintendent.

(d) It is most important that better means should be adopted for the strict enforcement of the Compulsory Education Law.

(e) It is equally important that better means should be adopted for the care of truants.

A. C. PERRY, Jr., Principal P. S. 85, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. (a) For the benefit of the pupil:

Our ultimate aim is to lead him to govern himself. He fulfils that aim only through training, for he is not born a self-governing individual. In training him toward this highest motive we are obliged to take him through a succession of lower motives. A very few pupils are amenable to nothing but compulsion; for them self-government can only be reached through compulsory government. Hence they must be compelled, else we are depriving them of the education which is their right.

(b) For the benefit of the schools:

The present method of evading this responsibility for the discipline of our pupils results in a wilful waste of time and energy by the law-abiding pupils, the teachers and the supervisors.

(c) For the benefit of the State:

It is wasteful for society to neglect the discipline of a child when he is eight years old, and as a result have to support him in a poor-house, jail or reformatory in his later years.

3. No better legislation can be devised than the section on the subject in the By-Laws of the Board of Education of the City of Brooklyn. If our principals cannot be trusted to exercise this authority, get principals or some other officials who can.

4. Superficially, perhaps, not worse; but fundamentally and actually it is so.

5. Undoubtedly. Is there any question that in a village of, say, two thousand inhabitants, the knowledge that the law had behind it no prompt, compelling force, but merely a system of preachments and transfers and vacations, would interfere with the proper maintenance of order?

6. If the opponents of corporal punishment will devise some rational and effective substitute therefor—which it is certain they have not yet done—they could rejoice no more sincerely than I would. I regard Dr. Bagley's discussion of the subject in his "Classroom Management" as most sane.

ANNIE B. MORIARTY, Principal P. S. 86, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. (a) Corporal punishment only promotes reform through fear or under supervision. It does not mould the character. It often engenders a secret spirit of retaliation.

(b) The tendency to use the rod grows on the dispenser and coarsens the moral fiber.

(c) The children of P. S. No. 86 are too frequently *cruelly beaten at home* without any evidence of reform. It would be difficult for any principal to exceed the severity.

(d) Parents should assume this responsibility after interview with principal. (In our district co-operation is easily secured, when necessary.)

4. The abolition made no difference in P. S. 86. There had never been corporal punishment in the school. The principal had abolished it when teacher of boys' classes, through conviction. If any "new" boys show a defiant air, the principal, *with the parent*, immediately cares for them.

5. Yes, temporarily. If principals have been obliged to change under the publicity of newspapers and public opposition.

Efforts of any teachers or principals to reform on any lines, when unattended by publicity, previous to the publishing of present law, did not interfere with "order and respect."

(Personally, I feel that if the Board of Education and the principals had advised about the matter without publicity, the development would have been unconscious to the pupils—children know too much now-a-days!)

6. (a) Increase of efficient officers to secure regular attendance, which promotes ambition.

(b) Definite work of the Children's Courts to compel parents to do their part.

(c) Increased privileges to send degenerates to a reform department of "parental" schools (not reformatories).

(d) Privilege for teachers to detain as long as they desire (under advice of principal) when special cases of misconduct require solitude and submission.

(e) Some testimonial certificate for marked improvement.

(f) Some system of certificate granted for character, attendance and effort that business houses would honor and demand when presented upon application to secure positions.

EGESTA BECK, Principal P. S. 88, Brooklyn:

1. Yes, in extreme cases.

2. While the great majority of children require no severe measures, there are, in most schools, a few children who, very early, get utterly beyond the control of parents, and who, if subjected to forcible control in the schools till better influences could be brought to bear, would be saved from themselves.

Parents of law-abiding pupils have a right to demand that their children be protected from the pernicious influence of the openly rebellious, and to that end principals should have sufficient authority vested in them to enforce the obedience of the children of parents who, through weakness, indifference or positive viciousness, fail to control. If parents knew how much of the time of the teaching force is consumed by such cases to the detriment of other pupils, they would realize the need of more efficient means of control.

3. I am in doubt as to the scope of this question.

The power of administering corporal punishment should be limited to the principal of the school, who should do it in private, with an instrument from the use of which no injury could result. Only one form seems to me admissible.

4. Worse. I know that there are boys infesting the street corners to-day that would be in school were principals authorized to exercise full parental authority. I even believe that the wave of lawlessness on the part of the youth of the city may be largely attributable to the removal of the only restraint that many of them ever knew.

5. It is this knowledge which works the injury, rather than the fact that corporal punishment is not administered. To know that it may be used is to lessen the need for its use.

Penalties are attached to misdemeanors of adults, not only as punishment for the guilty, but to act as deterrents for the would-be guilty. Is it reasonable to suppose that children, with their undeveloped powers, will be wiser than their elders and stand in need of no restraining influence?

6. So disagreeable is the infliction of corporal punishment that I should gladly see special classes for delinquents substituted. With small classes and teachers of exceptional qualities in charge, the problem of discipline might be partially solved.

MARY A. WARD, Principal P. S. 89, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. (a) There is, I believe, a stage of development in some few cases where nothing else is understood.
- (b) I believe *no* school is administered without use of corporal punishment in the home to aid the school. Said punishment is in many cases more brutally given than it would ever be in school.
3. I believe strokes on the hands by means of a flat strap at least an inch wide to be a good form. The conditions I think should be left to the judgment of the principal, who should be the only one allowed to use said punishment.
4. In this school the "discipline" has not suffered by reason of the abolition of corporal punishment, but we are in a good neighborhood and our authority is an established fact.
5. On the whole, yes, decidedly.
6. Though, as above stated, I am not opposed to corporal punishment, if such may not be used I should like to see the class teacher given an increased power of detention of pupils after school hours, subject to approval of principal; and the principal given the power to temporarily suspend a pupil.

MARY E. O'DONNELL, Teacher in charge, P. S. 90, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. When I was a child, I saw boys and girls brutally beaten every day in school, and there was no improvement in the conduct of these children as a result of corporal punishment. It was usually the children of the poor who

got this treatment. However, children who are a menace to the well-being of the school should not be permitted to remain in the classroom to demoralize other children by their bad example. Suspension has no terror for this type and there should be some special provision made for them by the Board of Education.

4. Generally better.

5. In many instances it does.

6. A great many parents are only too willing to shirk all responsibility in training children to be obedient and respectful. When a child is persistently disobedient, disrespectful and generally lawless, the parent should be fined in a public court. If it became a matter of dollars and cents with parents, we would soon see an awakening on the part of the parent and the child. Parents would learn that obedience must be taught from babyhood up, not when the child is eight or ten years old.

GEORGIANA E. BROWN, Principal P. S. 91, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. Physical pain does not create a desire to obey. Obedience may be obtained as the result of fear, but obedience obtained in this way has no lasting results and is an injury to the child rather than a help.

Punishment, to be effective, should fit the offense. The rod is not a logical punishment for the offenses of the school. The average conduct of the children to-day is fully better than formerly when the rod was used. The application of the rod produces an attitude of mind antagonistic to studies and to the school.

4. Better.

5. No.

LOUISE CASTLE, Principal P. S. 92, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. If corporal punishment is necessary I think the parent is the proper one to administer it.

4. About the same. The spirit of the school is better.

5. It does not interfere at all.

JOHN F. HARRIS, Principal P. S. 95, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. It is the only form of discipline for some pupils. There are many young pupils who would not misbehave if they knew you *could* use corporal punishment, and who merely laugh at the present form of discipline.

3. A good sound spanking is what is needed sometimes, and, if resorted to, should be administered not by the class teacher but by the principal or parent at the school.

4. Worse. Truancy on the increase. It takes too long to get a boy punished, under the present system, for truancy.

5. Yes, decidedly so.

6. I believe the present system should be used with the addition of corporal punishment suggested under "3."

ANDREW E. EICHMANN, Principal P. S. 97, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Drastic measures are needed at times.

(b) There is nothing in the By-Laws authorizing a principal or teacher to meet a case that should be disposed of "here and now." There are offenses that must be met summarily.

(c) There are children in practically every school whose condition is such that they are unable to respond to any other treatment.

3. (a) A strap that will never mutilate a limb.

(b) Punishment to be administered *in private* if necessary under witness.

(c) *Never* when *either* the child or the one administering the punishment is under the influence of passion.

(d) Only for gross misconduct and when no other means would avail.

(e) Preferably by some one not officially connected with the school.

4. Worse.

5. Most assuredly and precisely with that class of children mentioned in (c) of question No. 2.

G. O. TAPPEN, Principal P. S. 98, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. It aids in maintaining good discipline.

3. A spanking for small boys, a whip for large boys. In either case used as a last resort to secure obedience.

4. Worse.

5. Yes.

JOSEPH T. GRIFFIN, Principal P. S. 100, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. Because corporal punishment is opposed by an enlightened public opinion.

The discipline of certain schools might be improved, if corporal punishment were permitted, but its infliction would be regarded as such a complete reversion to the brutal policies of the past that the good results accomplished in a few individual instances would be more than offset by the general lowering of the moral tone of the school community, not only in its internal affairs, but in its relation to the world at large.

4. I have noted no difference, as my experience does not run back prior to the abolition of corporal punishment.

5. Yes, decidedly. At the present time every unruly pupil knows that he may violate every law of decency in his attitude toward the teacher, and if that teacher resent such conduct even by the mildest form of corporal punishment, the teacher immediately becomes the offender and the child a possible accuser. Their relative positions become reversed. The teacher is made the defendant in an embarrassing and humiliating action before the quasi-judicial committee of the Board of Education—not because she has injured the pupil in any way, but simply because she has violated a By-Law. The children's familiarity with this condition is certainly not conducive to good order and discipline.

6. (a) The formation of special classes for delinquent or deficient pupils is a great aid to discipline.
- (b) Co-operation between the schools and the courts where the parent of a disorderly child could be fined.
- (c) Power vested in the Children's Court to commit a refractory child to a disciplinary institution upon the complaint of the principal, duly authenticated and sustained by proofs of the child's inability or unwillingness to conform to school discipline.

MARY E. LYNCH, Principal P. S. 101, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. A punishment likely to descend, like the sword hung by a thread, is a thing which small boys take fairly good care to avoid. An average boy feels that a physical punishment is a disgrace in the eyes of his fellows, hence he will have none of it. Then there *are* the children who lie and steal—unpleasant as the terms sound—and the only thing they respect at all is a stronger physical force. Those children exist and many could be saved from worse misdeeds by a punishment they appreciated from the first.

3. Whipping with a whip. A whip around a boy's legs cannot injure, but it tends to make him think twice before being impertinent, and tends to form the habit of respect for superiors. It should be administered by the principal only, perhaps, to save an overwrought teacher doing more than is necessary.

4. Impertinence and "hookey" have increased.

5. To a great extent, among some pupils. They are not in a majority, but one pupil who needs corporal punishment, and doesn't get it at the right time, sometimes spoils three or four others, who, through lack of moral training of any kind at home, admire the boy who dares and who gets off with only what they consider ease, since it involves no punishment which they consider punishment.

W. W. SMITH, Principal P. S. 102, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. First let me say there are not more than two per cent. of the pupils who need corporal punishment. This two per cent., however, is the leaven in the

school which becomes a serious detriment to the welfare of the school. There are some boys whose attention and obedience can *not* be secured *except* through corporal punishment.

Theory says appeal to their better nature, treat them kindly, show them the effect of wrong-doing, the desirability of right-doing, etc. All this has been done over and over again; and still the same incorrigible boy remains, a positive hindrance to the work, interest and spirit of the class. Now shall we use corporal punishment and save that boy from himself, or turn him from the school and take chances of his failure and possible ruin in life? "Spare the rod and spoil the child."

3. The form of punishment should be the use of a rattan, or half inch rubber hose about a foot long, applied about the hips or legs. May I say here that to slap a boy's face, pull his ears or ferule him should be made a crime?

Punishment should *never* be before the class, but in a private room and always by the principal.

4. The discipline is worse.

5. I certainly know it does.

HOMER C. BRISTOL, Principal P. S. 103, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Some cases of school discipline, not many, have their best remedy in corporal punishment.

The prohibition of corporal punishment, by removing a restraint, makes school discipline more difficult. This is specially true where the teacher, not having the strongest personal impression, has difficulty and needs help in control.

While indisposed to use corporal punishment at all, and while not dissatisfied with being forbidden to use it, I believe that the schools would be better governed by its permissive and restricted use. So I sacrifice preference to conviction in replying as above.

3. *As to form:* Whipping with strap, ferrule or similar instrument.

As to person: The principal, who may depute an assistant to principal.

Record of cases: To state cause, previous disciplinary record, etc.

Responsibility of principal: Should be defined. He should keep such record as would enable him to explain any given case.

4. With the many, neither better or worse. With the few, worse.

5. I do.

ARTHUR D. STETSON, Principal P. S. 104, Brooklyn:

1. An unqualified "yes" or "no" is hardly a fair answer, for if some other adequate means of enforcing discipline were provided, it would probably be better than corporal punishment and I would prefer it.

2. Under present conditions there are in most schools a number of boys who have *no parental restraint*, and are of vicious and brutal instincts and degraded

habits. They play truant when they feel like it, they bully and beat smaller boys, and teach them to smoke cigarettes, to talk profanely and obscenely, and to do all sorts of lawless and indecent things. The harm they do much more than offsets the good that is done to the community in trying to educate them. Any form of moral suasion is lost on them. They cannot be sent to disciplinary schools for there is no place for them. Their parents are helpless. Fear of physical pain is the only thing that appeals to these boys.

Admitting all arguments about the barbarity of whipping, its brutalizing effect, etc., the fact remains that there is no other way visible at present to counteract the evil influence of these vicious boys.

3. If corporal punishment is to be administered, a strap or rattan applied *a posteriori* by principal in presence of janitor or some responsible person in some sequestered place, as, for instance, the janitor's room.

4. Worse.

5. Yes. In other days the mere knowledge that they might be punished had a salutary effect on the behavior of many children.

6. There should be disciplinary schools with ample accommodations for all children who are incorrigible and whose influence is evil in spite of the best combined efforts of principal, teacher and parents.

There should be better co-operation between the educational and the judicial departments. In the majority of these cases I believe the parents are helpless. In many cases they are to blame. Strict investigation should be made and if the parents are to blame, they should be held accountable.

Truant officers should be upheld by the courts.

The police should be compelled to make every child of school age found on the streets during school hours give a satisfactory account of himself, under penalty of arrest and complaint against parents.

HELENA M. CURRAN, Principal P. S. 105, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. Children are often not responsible for their misbehavior in school. Home conditions, malnutrition and physical defects are largely the cause of the trouble. To inflict corporal punishment in such cases would be the acme of cruelty and injustice.

4. Corporal punishment has never been used in this school.

5. Yes, in some cases.

J. V. WITHERBEE, Principal P. S. 106, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Since society depends, in its last analysis, upon the employment of force to compel obedience to its laws, and as a school is a miniature society, the right to compel obedience should be lodged in some one in the school. This is fundamental doctrine.

The rapid addition to our schools of children of foreigners, lacking in refinement, makes it necessary for the welfare of the school to place in the hands of the school a power which these children respect.

The higher the degree of civilization of a community, the less the employment of force in keeping order is required. Until such degree of civilization is reached in a school or miniature community, there should be vested in the executive the power to enforce obedience.

3. The old-fashioned slipper-like application of a strap is the form I would recommend.

The sixty teachers in this school are unanimous in the opinion that the power should reside in the executive of the school only, upon whose judgment its application should depend.

After the parents have been consulted and all milder means have been used to win over a pupil to right conduct, it is time that the cowardly disturber of the welfare of the class should be "brought to book."

4. It is undoubtedly worse. This is admitted by many who would not employ corporal punishment.

5. I certainly do.

This is the verdict of no less worthy educators than Drs. Merwin and Cruikshank, recently retired, who stated that they had not used corporal punishment in many years, but that, as soon as it was noised about in the "public press" that the right to use it had been forbidden by the Board of Education, they noted a decided deterioration in discipline.

OSWALD SCHLOCKOW, Principal P. S. 109, B., Brooklyn:

1. With proper safeguards, yes.

2. There are at present no adequate penalties that can be meted out to refractory pupils.

3. The principal should have the right, after the ordinary means to secure improvement in the conduct of the pupil have failed, to summon such pupil before some authorized person or persons (District Superintendent, Local School Board), in order to prove that the pupil is not amenable to moral suasion. If the charges are sustained, the pupil should be sentenced for a definite period of from one to five months, to be subjected to corporal punishment for certain *specified* offenses. Some such system as this would properly safeguard the punishment from abuse.

4. I cannot make a comparison, as my service during the past twelve years has been performed under By-Laws prohibiting the infliction of corporal punishment.

5. Yes—in certain cases.

CHAS. PERRINE, Principal P. S. 110, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. Without it, our teachers spend their vitality on one boy. The forty-nine good ones are denied their rights. In extreme cases, actual punishment

would save and make a man of the bad offender. In practice, we would not have to punish *if the boy knew we could*. That knowledge would prevent the bad ones leading the class to misbehave. The result would be better work by all, and teachers would be less nervous, healthier, able to be present more days, able when present to put their force into teaching.

3. I think it would be belittling to the kind of principals you demand and secure, to put any condition. Simply give permission to use corporal punishment to the principal or some third party he designates. The State law fully protects any but a brute. Don't call us all brutes. Few of us would ever punish if we had permission. I suggest a third party, because some foreign boy might violently resist a female or aged principal, with no police near to eject.

4. Worse.

5. Very decidedly. I could give instances of very small boys disgracing a whole school and openly stating that no one could touch them. These little chaps take perhaps more than half the time and energy of primary teachers and a surprisingly large portion of the time of assistants to principals.

6. I know only one man in Brooklyn who has opposed it, but we all want some other deterrent, if we cannot have that.

I suggest:

- (a) Give magistrates' power to summon and fine parents and to compel parents to make boys do right, to the district superintendents.
- (b) Give district superintendents power to transfer boys long distances away from bad companions, making allowance for car fare.
- (c) Give principals unrestricted right of temporary suspension.
- (d) Give principals full power to arrange transfers with neighboring principals to save the time of superintendents.
- (e) Permit detention after 3:30 in certain rooms.
- (f) Restore all possible rewards, such as good tickets, certificates, etc.
- (g) Permit demotion for punishment for a limited period.
- (h) Provide several more institutions to which the Children's Court may parole instead of making heroes of offenders.

EMILY G. BRIDGHAM, Principal P. S. 111, Brooklyn:

1. Yes, in hands of the principal.

2. There seems to be so little restraint to the conduct of children, either at home or upon the street, that unprecedented strain is occasioned the teachers. Bearing in mind the great influx of law-subverting foreigners, and the increased population, I doubt if there ever was so much juvenile depravity, even in our choice neighborhoods, as at present time.

3. As above (1), the principal should be given authority, and only when every form of moral suasion has been used and a child has proved to be refractory. The word refractory to be considered in its extreme sense. Children in my school days were caned for lateness, for absence, for noisy shuffling, for

not seeing the words in the reading lesson—offenses now which would be termed physical defects, or else as due to careless home conditions. I approve of Solomon's rod.

I think it is worse in very many sections. I also believe that much "*concealment*" is customary, by fear of both teachers and principals of being considered unsuccessful.

5. There is no doubt of it. Truancy increases, and the officers, in my judgment, never can cope with it. Small tradespeople offer inducements for children to work for them, and to absent themselves frequently. Such return to school with no desire to learn, and with corrupt practices learned from association with older boys. I am told by residents of this choice neighborhood (Park Slope) that the language used by boys at their play is shocking.

6. While I have expressed myself with the knowledge born of long service under varied conditions, I, personally, would not wish to use corporal punishment. I am in charge of a school wherein I taught for most of my career; the population is not so shifting as in other localities; the children grow up in the school, giving me opportunities for studying them. I am viewing the subject from a broader standpoint than my own narrow sphere.

In fine, any principal who cannot be trusted to use corporal punishment to the end of saving the child from criminal tendencies, or who is not in command of his own temper when administering such punishment, is unfit for his high calling.

I do not object to transferring an unruly pupil to different environments, but think that his stay in the second school should be short, and punishment for continued misconduct should be summary and corrective.

MARY E. CATTON, Principal P. S. 112, Brooklyn:

1. Yes. If more authority is to be given. Along other lines, no.

2. The child must be taught in school as well as out of it that a broken law meets with deserved punishment. There must be something added to the existing rules in order that this principle may be enforced.

4. Decidedly worse.

5. Yes. Many would not find its use necessary, but it is a wholesome thing for the child to know that it could be used when other measures fail.

6. Increased authority is needed by the principal. There must be some means of reaching the parent so that he is willing to co-operate.

MARY C. V. CONNOLLY, Principal P. S. 113, Brooklyn:

1. As a rule—No.

2. The use of force in our schools is degrading, and in most cases hardening in its influence rather than refining and uplifting.

3. Where the use of force is necessary, it should be inflicted in privacy, with the rod as a medium, and only in the hands of the principal, and only in the case of the most flagrant offense or insubordination.

4. The discipline (the true discipline) is better. (But this school is situated in a very desirable locality, with intelligent parents, who, in most cases, co-operate with the school management).

5. Yes. In some instances the knowledge that corporal punishment might be used would act as a deterrent.

6. Have no suggestion as to a substitute for corporal punishment.

MARY J. McHENCH, Principal P. S. 114, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. I think we should have the same power as the law gives the parent, and be responsible for the use of the same as the parent must be for his treatment of his child.

3. Cannot. It would depend entirely on the case and all the circumstances. I *rarely* had occasion to punish when pupils knew I could. I did not use a ruler or strap oftener than once a year.

4. Harder to maintain.

Eternal vigilance in small things, and the larger ones never occur.

5. It *greatly* interferes. If the pupils knew nothing about it, corporal punishment would be unnecessary. Newspapers must keep the subject constantly before parents and the matter is discussed before the indifferent, lazy bad boy until he is ready for school with his mind wholly bent on mischief to see what can be done about it.

KATHARINE R. CALLAHAN, Principal P. S. 115, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. The cause of the pupil's disobedient attitude may not be understood in a large school. One pupil in our school frequently begins the day by being irritable, sulky and disobedient. I knew his environment. For long periods I gave him needed nourishment. He always returned to his class ready to do his work. I know of other cases where environment influences children's conduct in school. I think corporal punishment would not permanently correct disobedience in these children.

4. We have few incorrigible children in our school. We do not have much trouble with discipline here when we have regular, good teachers.

5. I think it does not in this particular school. The children are, as a rule, tractable. Tact on the part of the person in charge usually secures obedience.

MOSES BECKER, JR., Principal P. S. 119, Brooklyn:

1. Yes, with discretion.

2. In exceedingly rare cases corporal punishment is necessary, yet, if it were fully understood that it might be resorted to, an ordinary public school could be governed for years without it. My thought is fully expressed in "Lectures on Teaching," by J. G. Fitch, page 119, lines 20 to 32, inclusive.

3. I think the principal of each school should have the authority to administer the punishment as his kind-heartedness and good judgment might direct.

4. I am unable to say.

5. In some cases, on the part of a bad boy, it interferes with his self-respect and consequently interferes with his respect for the school.

H. R. DAILEY, Principal P. S. 120, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. And yet if a boy enters a school determined to upset things generally, I think there should be some one in authority who on occasions could administer a flogging, but only one person, let it be a principal or superintendent.

3. A thin rattan.

4. Am hardly able to answer this question as at our school we have no trouble in disciplining.

5. Yes, in many schools.

6. Let a teacher find out what a boy or girl particularly dislikes to do and require them to work after hours, in this way being deprived of liberty for a time, or certain privileges. Each case requires special attention. No general rule can be followed.

JAMES J. REYNOLDS, Principal P. S. 122, Brooklyn:

1. No, except as outlined in answer to question 6.

2. (a) If corporal punishment was allowed, I fear that the great incentive to control class by far better means would be removed.

(b) The better class of parents are against it. They would be apt to take their children from the schools. The public schools, in time, would become the schools for the poor children.

4. Have never taught or supervised in a school where corporal punishment was allowed.

5. Yes. This is the worst feature of the case. By advertising the punishment the Board or the Court metes out to offending teachers, the newspapers have done much unnecessary injury to the discipline of our schools.

6. At least ten schools similar to Public School 120, Manhattan, should be established in the various Boroughs. The principals of these schools should be given the power to inflict corporal punishment.

JOSEPH G. FUREY, Principal P. S. 123, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. I have gotten along for thirty-five years without it.

4. Better.

5. In many cases, yes.

6. I do not believe much in the efficacy of punishment, particularly as it is inflicted in our schools. I believe that punishment is often meted out when a little inquiry would show that sympathy should be shown instead.

I have rarely failed to reach a boy, even the so-called incorrigible, after I have convinced him I am his friend. There is *some good* in the worst boy; try to find that out; appeal to it; cultivate it; it will pay. Any way, that is my experience, and I have handled some pretty hard cases in my time.

MARY E. QUINN, Principal P. S. 125, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. It is always the same child that is sent to be punished.
It hardens the feelings, and makes the child defiant.
4. Worse.
5. Yes.
6. Send all incorrigible children to an industrial school.

FREDERIC L. LUQUEER, Principal P. S. 126, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. (a) While perhaps effective in a few cases, it is harmful in many more.
(b) Whipping a child is looked upon, more and more generally, as cruel and cowardly, and as a confession of weakness and ignorance.
(c) Even the one using such punishment must feel something of this. If sensitive and sympathetic, as it is essential for a teacher to be, he is unnerved for making gentler influence effective, and for patient, good-humored, inspiring teaching.
4. Yes. With the increase of one's personal experience and power, with the many strong teachers in the school, with the interesting work, books and material furnished to-day, the discipline has improved.
5. No; not with the *proper* maintenance of order and respect, nor with true order and real respect.
6. Not so much "form of punishment" as *remedial measures*:
(a) Medical, and perhaps material, aid to those needing it.
(b) Formation of special classes in central schools of a district, to which might be sent the abnormal children of schools not having the requisite number of such children to form classes themselves.
(c) The possibility of *prompt* commitment, to a limited extent, to a truant or disciplinary school of approved plan as to grounds and equipment, as to instruction, guidance and oversight.

JOHN J. MALARKEY, Principal P. S. 127, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.
2. There are some boys in school who are not amenable to any other form of discipline. It is the only kind to which they are accustomed at home, and hence the only kind that makes any impression on them. They regard attempts to reach them through moral suasion as a confession of weakness.

and have been known to boast that they do not fear anything that can be done to them in school. Some of them are small boys who are simply naughty and too young to be impressed by any other consideration than that of physical fear. The certainty of immunity from the only kind of punishment that they respect tends to develop in them habits of lawlessness and contempt for authority.

3. (a) Spanking with a broad flat implement of wood.

(b) 1. Every other form of punishment tried and found ineffective.

2. Appeal to parents to have been found unavailing.

3. Examination by medical inspector showing freedom from mental and physical defects.

4. Pupil declared not amenable to ordinary discipline after a hearing before a properly constituted school tribunal of the district.

5. Infliction of punishment by a person not a member of supervising or teaching force.

4. I have not had sufficient experience with corporal punishment to express an opinion.

5. I believe that it does in the case of the pupils mentioned in my answer to No. 2.

6. Although not opposed to corporal punishment under present conditions, I believe that a better form of punishment in the case of those pupils mentioned in my answer to No. 2 would be their prompt and certain segregation from the regular classes as soon as it became clearly established that they are not amenable to the ordinary forms of discipline, and that their presence in a school is demoralizing or is a hindrance to the progress of the other pupils. I believe there should be one or more disciplinary day schools to which such pupils could be transferred by a district superintendent after proper trial and conviction. Then corporal punishment would not be needed in regular schools.

JAMES C. ROGERS, Principal P. S. 128, Brooklyn:

October 23, 1907.

1. I have talked the matter over carefully with my assistant and while both of us feel that nothing will come of this agitation we have no objection to letting our general views be known.

(a) We are opposed to corporal punishment in general, but feel that it should be a reserve power to be used by the principal only in cases of extreme need.

(b) All cases of genuine corporal punishment should be reported to the district superintendent.

(c) The interpretation of the phrase "corporal punishment" is far too wide at present. For example, forcible restraining of a pupil from running out of a room or from attacking another pupil or a teacher should not be termed "corporal punishment," as long as no brutality is shown.

(d) In the case of the lazy or vicious, discipline is a good deal worse, *i. e.*, without corporal punishment. Such pupils boast openly, "They can't do anything to you except suspend you." I know pupils who welcomed suspension. The knowledge on the part of pupils that no corporal punishment can be inflicted *does* interfere with the "proper order and respect" in schools.

I had two cases in one week of pupils falsely reporting that they had been struck by the teacher; it was done in the hope of getting out of work in school.

(e) The suggestion is that parents be *promptly* fined for a child's truancy or very bad behavior. Ninety-five per cent. of all possible cases for corporal or other punishment would at once drop out if this were done. But it will not be done. The *one* bad boy will still be given more consideration than the forty or fifty whom he annoys, retards and defiles.

Yours very truly,

JAMES C. ROGERS.

EDWARD P. CROWELL, Principal P. S. 129, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. (a) It would enforce obedience.

(b) It would check truancy.

(c) It would prevent a large number of boys from becoming hoodlums.

(d) A boy whose conduct was a menace to the class would be checked before he became a ringleader in mischief which we have no means at present to check.

3 (a) A good strap or a small rattan applied vigorously to the rump would be safe and effective.

(b) Administered by principal only and preferably with a witness present. A record should be kept of all cases and the consent of parent should be obtained if possible.

4. Worse—far worse.

5. Yes.

6. Boys have been spanked at home, strapped in school, paddled in college, and the community has not suffered; but, on the contrary, has largely benefited by these methods.

GEO. B. GERMANN, Principal P. S. 130, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. (a) The present moral suasion methods are inadequate to attain respect for law and order with boys who are deficient in moral sense. The adequacy of moral suasion presupposes the existence of a moral sense in the wrongdoer. This presumption is at times fallacious, as tested by experience.

- (b) Wherever the gentle methods of moral suasion fail, after several trials, recourse should be had to sterner methods. I believe that race experience teaches that corporal punishment, judiciously administered, is adequate to deter many from wrong who cannot be reached through precept and example.
- (c) The concepts of law and justice involve the ancillary concepts of the power of justice to enforce its decrees. Without the latter, the former are mere travesties on society's endeavor to preserve the integrity of the social fabric. The school as a microcosm should be guided by the same concepts. It must understand that "abdication of authority is not a solution for the difficulties of discipline."

3. The offenses for the remedy of which corporal punishment may be administered should be left to the discretion of the principal, who alone should be empowered to administer the punishment.

A record should be kept of all boys so punished.

It might be wise to require a report to be sent to headquarters at stated times relative to the number of cases.

Perhaps it might be wise to require the consent of one of the parents. A careful principal would do so anyway.

The principal should be required first to assure himself through consultation with the school doctor that the offender is not the victim of physical defects that may be responsible for misdemeanors.

4. Worse, with the hard cases who have neither adenoids, enlarged tonsils, defective nutrition, nor nervous weaknesses. I have asked our school physician for advice in some of these cases. He has diagnosed the cases as pure deviltry, and the remedy as exorcism with a rattan well administered.

5. Emphatically *YES*. The mere knowledge that justice can enforce its decrees with force, if need be, acts as a deterrent agent with boys as with men. Human nature changes little with the centuries. The basal and primary instinct of fear of great force plays an important role in society's regulative activities. When Russia's fleet was destroyed, contempt took the place of diplomatic respect for her unknown possibilities. Without our navy we would experience little of the courteous deference accorded us. Force to be effective need not necessarily be exercised.

Parents often beg me to whip their boy who is not amenable to the gentle ways of moral suasion. Were such punishment permitted, I know that in the great majority of cases no application would be necessary.

Would a boy be likely to inform his teacher that she is a "lousy skin," or to direct her to "go to hell," were he aware of the inevitableness of swift and severe punishment? Neither moral suasion nor the surgeon's knife is adequate to effect a cure. The remedy in such cases is an appeal to his intellect through the avenue of dermal sensibility. Failing a cure in this wise, expulsion from school should follow.

I presume that this school would present barely a dozen cases a year for whipping, were it permitted. The knowledge of the power in my hands would effectively regulate the conduct of some two dozen boys who are a trial to all having classroom relations with them.

The belief that there is a God in Israel is sufficient to give most of civilized humanity a guiding principle. He need not manifest Himself. The belief that severe punishment is permitted would function as a regulative principle for a certain class of wayward boys. The psychological fact is the same in both instances.

I beg to submit in support of my arguments from experience, the following opinions of eminent authorities:

"Whipping should be used as a reformatory agent only. It is better for boys than confinement in jail. . . . Whip rarely but severely. Whip only for serious or repeated offences, but let the whipping be of such a character that it will not need to be repeated often." Pp. 67, 68, *Mistakes in Teaching*, Inspector Hughes of the Toronto schools.

"Corporal punishment is the production of physical pain, generally by whipping, and this kind of punishment, provided always that it is not too often administered or with undue severity, is the kindest method of dealing with willful defiance, with obstinate carelessness, or with really perverted will, so long or so often as the higher perception is closed against appeal. . . . The view which sees in the rod the panacea for all the teacher's embarrassments is reprehensible, but equally so is the false sentimentality which assumes that the dignity of humanity is affected by a blow given to a child, and confounds self-conscious humanity with child-humanity, to which a blow is the most natural form of reaction, when all other forms of influence have failed." Pp. 41, 42, *The Philosophy of Education*, J. K. L. Roseneranz, Brackett's translation, 2d edition, Appleton & Co.

"One unfortunate effect of the false conceptions of democracy that are now so widespread among us is the steady decline in reverence and respect in the United States, not only for age, attainment, and authority, but for law itself. The essence of democracy is not subordination, but association; *yet the object of this association is obedience to government* as the result of a common deliberation through duly constituted authorities. To those authorities respect is due by every democrat. The mob yields none and will yield none.

"Many causes have no doubt contributed to bring about this decline in respect and reverence for authority and law. The weakening of religious faith, the loosening of the bonds of parental control, *the absence of real discipline from school life*, have all been at work to undermine the foundations of respect and reverence. We shall never get back to a true democracy, however, until the majesty of the law excites reverence and respect on its own account, until the family bond is drawn closer and tighter, and until children honor their parents as they did of old; and until the school understands that abdication of authority is not a solution for difficulties of discipline." P. 342, *Educational Review*, Vol. 33, No. 4 (April, 1907), Charter Day address at the University of California by President Nicholas Murray Butler.

DE FOREST A. PRESTON, Principal P. S. 131, Brooklyn:

1. Yes—as a privilege. No—as a practice.

2. There are a few cases in lower and middle grades where its administration would be of great value to the pupils.

Experience has proved that where it is restricted by the good judgment of the principals, and not by By-Law of the Board of Education, very little, practically no, corporal punishment is administered in schools, and much better discipline maintained.

A By-Law of the Board which assumes that principals are without good judgment, and are naturally brutish in temperament, can but place them very low in the estimation of parents and pupils, and do much to destroy the great essential of good discipline—RESPECT.

3. Under direction of principals only, and not until an appeal had been made to the parent. Limited to extreme cases of direct rebellion with boys under 12 years of age. Boys over 12 years may better receive adjustment through suspension, etc.

The entire matter should be left to principals, and if one is found unworthy of the trust he—not the whole number in the system—should be disciplined by the Board of Education.

4. I did not administer corporal punishment under the old rule, but find that since I have been classed by the Board of Education as unworthy of trust in this matter, under new regulation, the disrespect, discipline and tone of the school are much worse.

5. As previous answers indicate, I consider this the only serious phase of the whole question.

Strike out the By-Law entirely; let the law of the State apply; stop the discussion in the press and by high school officials, and let the principals have something of respect and much less of abuse and ridicule, and the matter will narrow down to here and there a case for investigation and perhaps discipline by the Board of Education where a principal has shown anger or poor judgment.

Give the credit of governing the thousands of children in schools, who are not properly governed at home or on the streets, to the faithful teachers, and the absence of corporal punishment to the teachers and the principals and not to the City Superintendent, and we will have a more healthful tone in our school system.

6. See previous answers.

ANNA G. BAUER, Principal P. S. 133, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. I object to corporal punishment because I fear that the power may be abused; but, at the same time, I believe that there should be some means adopted by which the child may be controlled and taught to respect authority.

It seems to me that the district superintendent and the principal should have more power to inflict speedy and effective punishment for wrong-doing.

4. As far as my personal experience is concerned, I find little difference in the discipline, but speaking generally I think that the abolition of the fear of punishment for wrong-doing has removed a great restraining influence.

CHARLES O. DEWEY, Principal P. S. 136, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. I have to deal with many boys whose mothers are widows unable to control the boys. Also the boys of many families in which the fathers are sea-faring men, away from home on long voyages. The mothers often ask me as a favor to help them correct these boys in this way, because the mothers are unable to do so. Nearly the same conditions prevail in the case of a sick or invalid father. By this means we could check many boys in bad careers before they enter the criminal class. We would then act in accord with the statute law of New York State as determined in many judicial decisions.

3. (a) *Form*: Strap or hose laid on posterior by principal, perhaps on hand when that is the offending organ.

(b) *Conditions*: Usually upon written request from the parents, after full investigation, trial of other available means, and final warning of this as penalty for further bad conduct. It should be the last resort, as a corrective measure—never as a retribution.

4. Worse. It is more difficult, requires much more time, requires *bluff* and *evasion* by a principal, where he should have the privilege of a wise discretion.

5. Yes. This is the crux of the whole matter. Rescind the By-Law and make no mention of it. The newspapers will soon spread the news with the inferences. My own impression is that very little corporal punishment will be inflicted in the schools when permitted. The knowledge that it may be done will prove a great deterrent.

6. *Comment I*: The truant school is not a deterrent for truancy:

(a) Because the procedure is so long and tedious that the truants look upon it with contempt.

(b) Returned truants do not dread a return to the Truant School.

Comment II: The courts do not execute the law with sufficient rigor:

(a) Paroled children are seldom reformed.

(b) Parents are not sufficiently punished for permitting truancy.

(c) Young criminals (burglars, indecent assault, thieves, unlawful entry after burglary) are returned on parole to school to associate with good and untainted children.

RUTH E. GRANGER, Principal P. S. 137, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. I believe it is much better to have one child suffer physically, and mentally perhaps as well, with no after effect that is harmful, *for a few minutes*, than for

an entire class to suffer because of the impaired work of the teacher, due to the behavior of the one child, *day after day*.

3. Punishment with the hand when the child first shows need of such treatment as a general rule is all that is ever needed. Cases where offense or age of child makes such corporal punishment of no avail should be settled with the parents, in most cases by them. (Parents, many of them, need more watching in this matter than principals do.)

4. Have had no experience with corporal punishment as a principal. As a teacher, I found corporal punishment made discipline better in that school, *with that principal*, than it is now in that school with another principal, without corporal punishment, *by far*.

5. Yes, with a few pupils in every school, and with many pupils in some schools.

I am fully convinced that a knowledge that corporal punishment could be inflicted would minimize the necessity for such punishment to no need at all in almost every school, to a very few cases in all others.

6. My answer to question 1 is "Yes," but I am opposed to corporal punishment except in very exceptional cases. I think no one form of corporal punishment or of any other sort can be prescribed, until the particular circumstances are taken into consideration. The facts about each case suggest a suitable form of punishment for deterrent effect.

MR. NATHAN S. JONAS,
Member, Board of Education,
New York City.

October 18, 1907.

DEAR SIR: The space for answers to questions on corporal punishment is too small for me to more than begin to express fully what I think on the subject.

After writing my answers, I consulted several of my teachers in the matter. It may be interesting to know that there was a unanimity of opinion among them that the right to inflict corporal punishment should be with the principal, but that it should be rarely used, however. All said the right should not be given to the *teacher*. All thought the knowledge that it could be inflicted would make the need for it very small. Few of my teachers ever taught where corporal punishment was allowed, but the few who have had experience with it hope it will never be allowed in the schools *as it was before*. Their remembrances of its *abuse* are dreadful to consider.

Very truly yours,

RUTH E. GRANGER.

W. L. SPRAGUE, Principal P. S. 139, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. So many parents are opposed to it that their antagonism is roused against school, principal and teacher. The pupil, influenced by parents, is more rebellious and troublesome than ever.

4. About the same.

5. I think not.

6. I am opposed to corporal punishment by principal or teacher, but think it should be administered as a last resort by parents, either at home or in the school. Where parents are remiss in this duty and pupils still refractory, I would suggest that a trial be held before the district superintendent and the local board, with power to commit to the parental home, if necessary.

SARAH E. SCOTT, Principal P. S. 140, Brooklyn:

I have been told that in No. 16, Brooklyn, during the rule of the late Mr. Dunkley, the discipline was notably good without resort ever to corporal punishment, but at the same time the pupils knew that it was in the power of the principal to administer such punishment at his discretion. I do not think it safe to limit publicly the power of a principal over the children of his school. At the same time I am inclined to think that corporal punishment is degrading to teacher and pupil and should never be resorted to except when all other means fail. I have never recovered from the feeling of repulsion that I felt on the one occasion of my seeing a schoolmaster strike a little boy. The circumstances justified it; the principal was a good man; but I never could forget that it was a larger boy using his strength against a smaller one. No - and yet I believe many of our schools need a stronger government.

ANNA M. OLSSON, Principal P. S. 141, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. The average teacher or principal is not yet good enough to ensure against the liability of the abuse of the power to inflict corporal punishment.
4. Since I have been acquainted with the elementary schools of Brooklyn corporal punishment has not been permitted.
5. I believe it does only in exceptional cases.
6. I can give no general suggestion. Each case should be taken individually. Often it is the parent who should be dealt with rather than the child.

ANNIE A. L. EGAN, Principal P. S. 142, Brooklyn:

1. Yes. Boys' schools.
 2. My reason for saying "yes" is that I honestly think that the lawless behavior of boys in the streets, during the past few years, is due to the fact that they have not been well disciplined in the schools.
 3. The principal to have the power to give an incorrigible boy a strapping. Boy not to be punished before the other children.
 4. It has been much harder to maintain discipline in boys' classes since they know that the principal hasn't any power over them.
 5. *I most certainly do.*
- My answers to the above questions are of a disinterested nature, as I am principal of a girls' school, having boys only in the lower grades. I have never had the least reason to wish to use corporal punishment, but my sympathies are with the principals who have boys' schools.

CARRIE IKELHEIMER, Principal P. S. 143, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. There is a certain element in all grades of society who can be cowed by force, but if used, they become hardened to it.
3. See No. 6.
4. I have had no experience with corporal punishment.
5. Yes.
6. If parents could be summoned to school and upon failure to respond could be then summoned and fined by district superintendents, I think most of the offenders would improve from time to time. If this method fail with an offender, then he or she should be transferred by the district superintendent to another school to try again under new surroundings.

LEON W. GOLDRICH, Principal P. S. 144, Brooklyn:

1. No.
2. (a) It is brutal and a relic of barbarism.
 - (b) It is generally inflicted to satisfy the anger of the weak teacher or the weak principal.
 - (c) It may be inflicted to remedy an evil beyond the pupil's control, (1) physical defect (2) mental defect (3) lack of nourishment, etc.
 - (d) It leaves no lasting impression.
 - (e) When you reach the heart of a child by a proper appeal (not physical pain which seldom goes beyond the skin) you have won the child's love, admiration and respect.
4. I have not had sufficient opportunity to judge. I was appointed principal on September 4, 1907.
5. Yes. I believe that children should not know the limits of the powers or authority of the school principal.
6. Increase the powers of the principal.
 - (a) As to truants.
 - (b) As to incorrigibles.

Give principals power to have hearings, and after satisfactory investigation give them the privilege to send types (a) and (b) to proper institutions.

HENRY LUDWIG, Jr., Principal P. S. 145, Brooklyn:

1. Yes, with certain restrictions—for boys only.
2. There are a few pupils, who, after all our present means of discipline are exhausted, still refuse obedience to, or defy the authority of, the teacher. Very often too much of the time of the class and of the teacher and much nervous energy on the part of the teacher are wasted on some pupils who are insubordinate. The mere fact that corporal punishment is permitted would keep any pupils from molesting a teacher and interfering with the instruction of

In this school of 2600 pupils I do not think I would care to use corporal punishment more than about once a month; still, I should have the power to use it.

3. Whipping with strap or rattan; not over the head, arms, upper part of body or below the knees.

Corporal punishment should be administered by the principal—never by a teacher.

The punishment should be given in the presence of a third party. A report of the cause of the punishment and the method of punishment should be sent to the district superintendent; this would act as a check on over severe or too frequent application of this form of punishment.

4. We do maintain discipline as before, but with too *great* expense of time and energy.

5. Yes.

JENNIE M. MACKAY, Principal P. S. 146, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. (a) More respect and less defiance would be shown to teachers.

(b) There are some pupils to whom only this kind of punishment appeals.

(c) Parents resort to this form of punishment, and those in parental authority to children for five hours daily should have the privilege.

3. *Form*: Whipping with a thin small rattan.

Conditions: To be administered only by the highest executive in the school, not by teachers, and only in the most extreme cases.

4. Worse.

5. Yes.

CHAS. D. RAINE, Principal P. S. 147, B., Brooklyn:

1. All things considered I must say "No."

2. While occasionally a case presents itself concerning which I feel that it would be better to chastise the boy by a judicious whipping rather than to exclude him from school, yet considering that corporal punishment is liable to lead to abuse, and has led to it in the past, I cannot conscientiously recommend its adoption or sanction by the Board.

4. I believe that the discipline in my school as a whole is as good as under former conditions. I see very little difference, if any. I have no serious difficulty with the discipline in my school at the present time nor have I had in the past.

5. Yes, I think that this in large measure is true. Some pupils seem to have the notion that they will be sustained in defying the teacher and other school authority. In some cases I think that too much attention is paid to criticisms and charges made by pupils against teachers and principals. This in connection with the publicity given to the fact that corporal punishment is prohibited breeds in some contempt for authority.

6. Mere control will not meet the needs. Autocratic domination is out of place in a school. Wholesome discipline, good spirit inculcated, pleasing, inspiring personality, firm but kind management, the exercise of good common-sense and a just administration of affairs are a principal's best aids. Training is of more value than teaching, and discipline means training. In every school, however, especially a boys' school, cases will occur sometimes that are not amenable to training or to kind and just treatment. Such as are deficient in regard to school law and the rights of others in school should at once be brought to trial, and if found guilty, separated from the school society and be placed under restraint in a reformatory, just as persons who are a menace or a disturbance to society at large are treated. And this should be swift and sure.

HENRY E. HARD, Principal P. S. 149, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. I do not think the schools the place for corporal punishment; it should be done by parents at home. I think violence begets violence, and produces a rebellious and resentful spirit in the pupils. When allowed it is frequently administered in anger and haste, and defeats its own ends.

4. I find the discipline the same, but the school spirit better.

5. Yes, I do. Since a free expression of opinion is requested, I shall venture upon a suggestion. I should like to see the By-Law of the Board changed to a recommendation in regard to corporal punishment. This would have the same effect upon us as a By-Law, but not upon the children. There are extreme cases in which large boys have been known to strike women teachers and to use insulting and obscene language to them. If such boys are dealt with in the school as similar rowdies would be on the street, it does not seem to me to be anything like corporal punishment as an institution; and if parents make charges for such treatment, it seems to me their "redress" should be in the police court and not with the Board of Education.

6. I do not think we need any other form of punishment (except perhaps to allow teachers a longer time than half an hour to master an insubordinate child by moral suasion), but only that existing laws should be enforced by the city magistrates. If we had their support in fining parents whose children are allowed to run the streets, in dealing according to the law with youthful criminals, it would be all the support we need.

KATHARINE R. BRADY, Principal P. S. 151, Brooklyn:

1. No.

2. I think it a barbarous practice, degrading alike to pupil and teacher.

4. Better.

5. No.

TRUANT SCHOOL

ROSCOE V. WOLFE, Acting Principal Truant School, Brooklyn:

1. Yes.

2. The fact that there is no (open) corporal punishment has raised more insubordination in a certain element among the boys than anything else that I know of. The fact that corporal punishment was allowed would deter some in whom the moral sense is stunted from committing many disorders. With an ideal teacher or a manager of children corporal punishment is not necessary. It has a value in upholding a weak teacher. In the case of many schools of which I know, corporal punishment does exist. In my eight years' experience I have not been in a school where it did not exist, more or less.

3. The Board of Education could furnish a certain size rattan.

The striking places could be limited to the hands or the hips.

Corporal punishment should be limited to the principal.

It could be administered in presence of witnesses.

5. I most decidedly believe that this knowledge leads to many disorders that would not have happened had the boys known that corporal punishment could have been inflicted.

BOROUGH OF QUEENS

HIGH SCHOOLS

P. E. DEMAREST, Principal Bryant Boys' School, Queens:

1. Yes, but only by principal.

2. Of course the question does not apply to the high school at all. After an experience as a teacher in every grade of elementary schools, as principal of a primary school, as principal of different grammar schools, as a superintendent of city schools, as principal of a high school, all of which covers a period of thirty years, my experience and observation lead me to the conclusion that a principal should have the right to enforce obedience to authority. Before the development of moral responsibility a resort is necessary in a comparatively few cases to corporal punishment, and the fact that the principal has the power to enforce the legal regulations of the school has a wholesome effect. During twenty years in the elementary schools I inflicted corporal punishment five times, and I am sure that the effect was wholesome upon the school and corrective to the pupils upon whom it was administered.

3. Should be in the form of a "spanking" upon a portion of the body not easily injured. Should be administered by the principal in private with perhaps one teacher present as witness. The reason for privacy is to preserve any self-respect that the child may have. The effect upon the school is better; for the students always learn of the matter somehow and yet have not the opportunity for "hero worship" which usually follows when a pupil has been whipped in the presence of his classmates.

4. Not having been a principal of elementary schools since its abolition, I cannot answer from experience. I do know, however, that it is not abolished, for it is administered by determined teachers in some of those schools whose principals are talking against it and who point to their schools as examples to sustain their arguments.

5. I do.

CHARLES J. JENNINGS, Principal Jamaica High School and P. S. 47, Queens:

1. On general principles "No." I qualify my answer as below.

2. I think corporal punishment in the school is degrading to both pupil and teacher. It is next to impossible for either party to preserve his temper, which is about the same thing as his self-control. When a person loses his temper or his self-control, he immediately is conscious of a loss of self-respect. The pupil, under such circumstances, gets no good from his punishment, and the teacher feels a degrading effect upon himself.

3. I am in favor of corporal punishment as a last resort under these circumstances. No teacher should ever use corporal punishment under any circumstances. When the principal has conferred with the parent, and, as a result of their deliberations together, the conclusion has been reached that some form of corporal punishment is advisable, and the parent distinctly gives the principal the authority and right to inflict it upon the pupil, then, I believe, the principal should be allowed by the Board of Education to inflict it. I cannot see how such a plan could very well be abused.

4. I will say that the occasions when corporal punishment might have been used to advantage in my experience have been very rare. I have had no trouble with the discipline of the pupils who have been under my supervision.

5. I believe that there are a few boys to whom the knowledge that corporal punishment might be inflicted would be salutary, but I would not be in favor of any corporal punishment in this school except as advised under answer 3.

6. The present method of a substitute for corporal punishment is very cumbersome and slow in operation. What is needed is some swift method of bringing the culprit to terms at once. To suspend a pupil from school for several days is what most boys who come under such discipline want, namely, to be relieved from school attendance.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

JOHN F. QUIGLEY, Principal P. S. 1, Queens:

1. Yes. The present means of discipline not adequate for all cases. The placing of refractory boys in a lower grade or denying promotion to them is not justifiable, and if resorted to would not bring about the desired result.

2. I am in favor because experience (over twenty-eight years) teaches that there are many boys who cannot be managed by moral suasion and kindness and who will not be orderly and in an attitude of obedience in the classroom without the fear of physical pain.

3. I believe the use of the rod or rattan should be given to the principal only and that the punishment should be given in private.

4. Worse.

5. I do. I am quite sure of it.

KATE H. MCWILLIAMS, Principal P. S. 2, Queens:

1. No.

2. For young children the only effective punishment which follows close upon the mean action and which is administered by a person present when the offense is committed. There is little value in punishment deferred until it can be administered by a principal.

For the vicious or high-spirited lad in the higher grades such corporal punishment as may properly be administered in a school tends to make the boy more defiant and refractory.

4. The abolition of corporal punishment has had no effect on the discipline of this school.

5. I have heard of cases where pupils have defied teachers because of such knowledge openly asserted.

6. I believe that when a teacher reports a pupil as refractory the principal should keep the child under close observation, removing him from the classroom if his presence is in any way disturbing. When efforts to secure the cooperation of his parents prove ineffectual the principal should have the power to suspend or expel him.

In case of suspension or expulsion immediate report should be made by the principal to the authority in charge of compulsory attendance.

ROBERT L. CONANT, Principal P. S. 4, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. I favor corporal punishment because at present we have no means of obtaining obedience and order except through moral suasion, and this is ineffective in extreme cases. If we suspend pupils they are invariably sent back to us. I believe in its use in extreme cases only.

3. I am in favor of spanking in the good old-fashioned way, to be administered by the principal. I think perhaps it would be well to restrict its use to cases in which the parent favors this form of discipline.

4. Our discipline has not changed materially, but the spirit of lawlessness is stronger than it was, and we have been obliged to expend more energy and time in keeping certain pupils within bounds.

5. I do. Almost invariably when a parent tells us to use corporal punishment if necessary, and the child knows what the parent has said, there is no further necessity for its use.

MATTHEW D. QUINN, Principal P. S. 5, Queens:

1. With limitations, yes; at least until principals are given wider power and discretion relative to truancy, depravity and defiance on the part of the exceptional few who wield a bad influence in the school.

2. Sometimes ONE application of corporal punishment will put an end to wasteful interruptions in the instruction of the class, caused by some bully who needs some kind of summary treatment when he has demonstrated the futility of further continuance of all the other approved methods applied by both principal and teacher with patience and hope and all the moral power they possess.

In considering this question, I think we should always take into account the rights and interests of the 99 per cent. of children waiting for the best instruction a teacher is able to give under favorable circumstances, as well as the side of the transgressor.

3. All other methods should be faithfully and hopefully tried first.

Parents should be notified frequently first.

Punishment should be administered privately, and after the lapse of some time after the transgression.

It should be always administered by the principal.

4. In truth, I do not see any very great change, as we have always been able to get the good-will of our pupils as a whole. There have been times, however, when I could have prevented waste of time of class as a whole and of teacher by one application of corporal punishment.

5. It has an influence that is not desirable on the few pupils that seem to be somewhat ready to go as far as the law allows.

THOMAS H. SWEENEY, Principal P. S. 6, Queens:

1. No. (See question 6.)

4. Better.

5. No. Not in this school.

6. I should like to know that I have the power to punish a pupil, and think that if such power were given the principal, it would have a salutary effect among refractory boys.

I fully realize, however, that if this power were to be given to the system it would be but a short time till its abuse would become quite general. One man would use corporal punishment where another would use just as effective a remedy.

The people who favor corporal punishment most strongly are those who were brought up under a system of discipline.

MARTIN JOYCE, Principal P. S. 7, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. (a) There are a few cases which cannot be controlled very well otherwise.

(b) Because an effective form of punishment is needed.

(c) Parents cannot control their children, in a few cases, and ask the school to do it.

(d) There is about one boy in every hundred schoolboys who uses up the time and nervous force of the school, at the expense of the ninety-nine, for which expense there is no adequate return.

3. I would exercise no corporal punishment if I could possibly avoid it. The established fact that I was permitted to do it would be sufficient for most bad cases. If I was obliged to exercise corporal punishment, I would get the consent of the parents, lay the boy across a chair, face downwards, and apply a strap.

4. I find it much more difficult to maintain.

5. Most certainly.

MELVIN HIX, Principal P. S. 9, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. I believe that corporal punishment is in entire accord with the laws of Nature and of God. I believe that is the only effective punishment in some (perhaps few) cases. It has been found necessary under all forms of government that have ever existed on the face of this earth and that for adults whose maturity and experience ought to render them amenable to all those higher considerations which are appealed to by the "moral suasionists." How much more then is the necessity of checking at once by force if necessary the evil tendencies which children have inherited from criminal and semi-criminal parents!

It is, I believe, admitted that with certain sorts of persons leniency is always mistaken for weakness and simply provokes contempt. The result in the case of such persons is that the contempt is transferred from the too lenient wielder of authority to the law; hence, in my opinion, comes the constantly growing disregard for law which is such a marked characteristic of our country and our time.

3. I do not desire to see the right to inflict corporal punishment in the hands of the class teacher, nor even in the hands of the principal. I would suggest the principal and two teachers (perhaps the truant officer might be added) should be a kind of court. This court should have the power to try the case and render a verdict. In all cases the parent should have been notified to appear and no infliction of corporal punishment should be allowed until the parent has twice been summoned to appear and has been informed of the condition of his boy (of course, I do not contemplate the flogging of girls).

I think you will see my idea. It is this: make the infliction of corporal punishment a possibility only after so much trouble that it will be rare; yet leave it open as a possibility; give each parent ample warning and sufficient time to attend to the culprit himself; and have the verdict come from the school rather than the individual teacher and principal; but have power to inflict it *reside somewhere in the school*.

Punishment should be by the rod; it should be thorough but not injurious. It should be private so far as pupils are concerned, but in the presence of witnesses.

4. Worse.

5. I do most emphatically.

6. In case the Board of Education does not choose to allow the infliction of corporal punishment, it should take immediate measures to segregate a considerable number of pupils. These pupils should be placed in special school where their influence will not affect other pupils; and they should be taken completely and permanently from the custody of their parents.

More power and right of initiative should be conferred upon principals.

The present system of discipline exhausts the teacher, takes the time of the class, secures immunity to the evil-doer, and is productive of no permanent good.

J. J. JENKINS, Principal P. S. 10 and 15, Queens:

1. Yes.
2. It should be used by the principal only in cases of open rebellion to necessary regulations.
3. Corporal punishment should be administered by no other person than the principal and by him only in the most extreme cases, and then a strap should be used.
4. Worse.
5. This is the main difficulty. If pupils knew that corporal punishment could be inflicted, there would arise very little occasion for its use.

THEOPHILUS JOHNSON, Principal P. S. 11, Queens:

1. No.
2. If at all necessary, should be administered by parent.
It is degrading for a principal to act as whipping master.
It tends to make cowards and sneaks out of boys, instead of courageous men who dare to do right.
It is no longer used in reform institutions.
- Any child who cannot be governed by co-operation of parents ought to be placed in a truant school, where those who possess special aptitude for such work may have a chance to govern him without corporal punishment.
4. Better.
5. No.

6. I believe that, if subdivisions 3 and 4 of Section 48 of By-Laws gave a principal the right to suspend a pupil for a limited time or until parent was given time to see the principal about the case, 99 cases out of 100 would be managed without any further trouble. In case the parent fails to respond to request of principal to call at school to see about his child, then the principal ought to be given power to continue the suspension and be required to refer the case to the district superintendent. Parents ought to have a right to appeal to district superintendent, but not until they have tried to settle the case with the principal.

Parents and pupils ought to be made to feel that the principal is not tied down with red tape in executing a sentence against an evil work, and a child ought not usually to be kept from school as long as is now necessary for a case of suspension to be decided.

Self-government, rationally conducted, will do much to educate a child in regard to his proper relation to his superiors (in position), and in teaching him to have a regard for the rights of others. These are the things a boy must learn in order to become a good citizen. Many troublesome pupils become helpful and manly under self-government.

FRED H. MEAD, Principal P. S. 12 and 78, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. There are a few boys in every school who will not yield to reason. They are made to mind through fear of bodily pain only.

In such cases it frequently happens that there is no control at home, or a lack of co-operation with the school.

For such cases, corporal punishment in the schools, or even a knowledge that corporal punishment may be administered there, will, I believe, bring about better results.

3. "Spanking"—use of the strap—administered by the principal or the person in charge of the school. This, I believe, should be used as the *last resort*—when other means have failed—in cases of persistent disobedience and of flagrant immorality.

I believe the principal should have the power to treat such cases as he would treat them in case of his own child, and he should be held liable for the misuse of that responsibility.

4. I find the bad boy worse. He is fearless if he cannot be controlled at home.

5. I do so believe.

J. D. DILLINGHAM, Principal P. S. 13 and 14, Queens:

1. Yes, with proper limitations.

2. (a) The knowledge that the principal possesses the power of inflicting corporal punishment will often deter pupils from committing acts of insubordination.

(b) Children in the intermediate grades, whose parents are lawless, indifferent or vicious, have not been trained to respect authority, and consequently do not readily respond to a system of school discipline based solely on moral suasion.

(c) The present system of moral suasion consumes too much of the teacher's time and vitality, thus seriously impairing her usefulness and efficiency.

3. Use of rod by the principal or assistant to the principal only in extreme cases, or where the incorrigibility of the child has been established by frequent written reports of overt acts.

4. While the discipline has not deteriorated, it has been maintained at too great an expenditure of time and effort on the part of the teacher.

5. I do.

ARTHUR C. MITCHELL, Principal P. S. 16 and 19, Queens:

1. No.
 2. The conditions in our community are such that it is unnecessary. The tendency is to use it too often.
 4. I find no material difference.
 5. I do in many schools—conditions vary.
 6. Change in By-Laws.
- The principal on the spot should have the power to suspend a pupil and summon parent.

JOHN HOLLEY CLARK, Principal P. S. 20, 21, 23 and 24, Queens:

1. Yes, under certain restrictions.
2. The knowledge that the principal has this power, even if he does not choose to use it, has a salutary influence in enforcing discipline. Although the probability is this form of punishment would never be needed in the Flushing schools, yet in schools where there is a large element of rough, insubordinate and insolent boys, corporal punishment, properly administered, would be very efficacious.
3. This form of punishment would preferably be administered with a suitable strap or whip. Its use should be restricted to the principal, and he might be required to report in writing every case and the circumstances.
4. There has been no great difference in Flushing.
5. I do so believe. This effect is doubtless much more observable in some schools than in others.

TERESA A. FOGARTY, Teacher in charge P. S. 25, Queens:

1. No.
2. (a) I think it creates a *wrong* spirit among the pupils. I should not like to govern through fear.
(b) When there are so many teachers, this punishment might be used indiscriminately.
4. Just as good and far more pleasant.
5. I think it may with a certain class of children.
6. I think punishment should be a natural consequence, for example:
(a) If a pupil wastes his work hours, make him work during recreation time, if necessary remain after dismissal.
(b) If he breaks a pane of glass, let him replace it.
(c) If he whittles with a knife or has anything out that does not belong to business, deprive him of them, and let him know such articles are never to be returned to him, etc., etc.

HENRY DELAMAIN, Principal P. S. 27, 28 and 29, Queens:

1. No.
2. Danger of abuse.
4. We never had any serious difficulty on the discipline question, and I should say that it is now, as it always has been, good.
5. There are certain cases in my schools, which I suppose exist more or less in all schools, where this knowledge does interfere with law and order, but it is a very, very small number, and when necessary I call upon the parent to administer the proper chastisement.

GEORGE W. DORLAND, Principal P. S. 31, Queens:

1. No, except perhaps in a few extreme cases.
2. *Reasons for corporal punishment*:—It appeals to fear, and is therefore effective, and for very young children, logical. It is simple and easily applied, and, in extreme cases, is the most merciful punishment.
Reasons against:—It is unnatural, except when applied immediately by the person offended; it requires almost impossible self-control on the part of the administrator. It leads to temper and prejudice, and *it is negative*.
3. In the extreme cases referred to, a severe whipping by the parent or guardian in the presence of the principal and the person or persons offended.
4. "Order" may not be quite so good. "Discipline" is better.
5. No. But I do believe that the knowledge that there is no adequate punishment for extreme cases does interfere at times. If we cannot have other adequate remedy, then let us have corporal punishment for its possible deterrent effect.
6. Give principals the absolute right of expulsion. The idea of compulsory education is all right, but some children should *not be permitted* to attend school. This would help inculcate in the minds of children that attendance in school is not an enforced task, but a privilege and a pleasure. How about giving principals that want it corporal punishment, and those that do not, power of expulsion? Or both?

ANNA BRETT, Teacher in charge P. S. 32, Queens:

1. Yes.
2. After moral suasion has failed repeatedly, in some cases a little skin irritation is more beneficial to some boys than any other form of punishment.
3. A few strokes on the palm of the hand, I think, would be all that is necessary, and that only after everything else had failed. The mere knowledge that such punishment could be given would in many cases act as a deterrent, I believe.
4. I find it worse.
5. Yes, because I have heard some pupils glory in the fact that their teachers could not punish them.

JOHN A. LOOPE, Principal P. S. 33, 34, 35 and 36, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. I favor it, in extreme cases, because there is occasionally a child who cannot be controlled except by resorting to it or to something worse. Such a child must be controlled for its own sake, and for the sake of the others in the class.

A child who is persistently disobedient or impudent to the one in authority is so because he feels assured of ample protection from some source. He feels safe in defying the teacher, and cares little for any penalty which, under the present By-Law, can be inflicted upon him. The knowledge that he might have to suffer physical pain and humiliation would, in most cases, act with sufficient deterrent force, and it would seldom be necessary to inflict the extreme penalty.

3. In the very few cases where it would be found necessary I would recommend the old-fashioned method, known as "spanking," because it combines the elements of humiliation and physical discomfort in about the right proportion, and is not likely to injure the subject.

4. Worse.

5. I am certain that it does. Children frequently take refuge behind the By-Law forbidding corporal punishment. They say among themselves boastingly that the teacher does not dare to lay her hand upon them. They dare the teacher to touch them, and afterward parade their heroism before their fellows. They have become disobedient and impudent to a degree that I never knew under the old rule. This, of course, applies more forcibly to a few than to the greater number, but the influence of the few victorious bad boys is much worse than it would be were those bad boys to suffer defeat. At present the teacher is the defeated one, and receives the contempt of certain pupils—in fact, most of them, if an issue is raised. If he could win he would have their respect.

Children respect the teacher who controls them—witness their conversations anent their instructors. Diminish the power to control and you similarly affect the power to command respect. Keep children in an orderly condition, by means of force if you must, and they will soon become orderly by habit. Then there will be no friction and no need for severity, and that respect and consideration so necessary to a successful school will be had in abundance, and corporal punishment will be but a dead memory of times which neither pupil nor teacher would bring back.

J. M. WHITENACK, Principal P. S. 37 and 38, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. There are cases where nothing else will inspire proper respect for school regulations.

3. I favor the use of the rod applied by the principal to the lower extremities, that is, in extreme cases after moral suasion has failed. It should be administered in private.

4. Worse. █

5. I do. I have had an excellent opportunity to observe on this very point. In my present position from 1894 till our school was taken into the city, corporal punishment was insisted upon by the then Board of Education.

S. J. ELLSWORTH, Principal P. S. 39, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. Certain classes are completely dominated and disrupted by one or two disorderly children who could be controlled by the administration of corporal punishment, and cannot be controlled in any other way while they are in the class.

3. The "form" of punishment should be determined and administered by the principal to suit the needs of the case. When a boy sits in his seat and refuses to leave the room at the command of the teacher or principal, the principal should have authority to forcibly remove him. When a boy gets up out of his seat and says he is going home, the teacher should have authority to forcibly detain him.

4. On the whole, discipline is neither better nor worse, but the ability of the bad boy to dominate and disrupt the class was never so great under a system where a principal had "restraining power."

5. Yes.

WM. M. GILMORE, Principal P. S. 42, 43 and 44, Queens:

1. No.

2. I do not favor the use of the rod by the principal or class teacher. I think, however, in cases of persistent and wilful disobedience on part of the pupil, that the principal and, if necessary, the class teacher also, should be permitted to take hold of said pupil with sufficient firmness to convince him that he has no right to wilfully disregard the rules of the school.

4. It has not materially changed.

5. Where there is co-operation between parent, teacher and principal, I do not think it does. Where there is not, probably corporal punishment at school will not materially change the attitude of the pupil.

6. In my opinion each individual case should be dealt with according to the judgment of the principal and classroom teacher, excepting that severe corporal punishment should not be inflicted.

MARGARET SCOTT, Principal P. S. 48 and 50, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. In my neighborhood many Italian and colored boys, 13, 14 and 15 years old, have been forced in from the streets by the attendance officer. In some cases boys have never attended school. The foreigners, particularly, cannot be brought to see our right to make them attend.

These boys have a contempt for talk. They designate attempts to reason with them as hot-air. Keeping for thirty minutes after three is no punishment. Parents cannot help. There is just one thing boys understand and do respect—active action against them.

3. By principal using rattan on palms of hands.

4. It is harder to discipline. A teacher often has to stop working with forty or fifty pupils and waste half an hour's time trying to bring some unruly boy to reason.

5. Yes. Keeping in or sending for parent does not increase respect of unruly boy for law or order.

I. N. FAILOR, Principal P. S. 52, Queens:

1. No.

2. To govern children by fear is wrong in principle. Our first duty is to make good citizens of these boys and girls. Good citizens have no fear of law. They are above it. They do right because it is right. The rod is a relic of barbarism. It must go.

To strike a child, to bruise its tender flesh, be it done by parent, teacher or any one else, is *brutal*.

4. I find it no worse.

5. For those who are governed by fear, yes. For those who are *not* governed by fear, no.

6. I have no suggestion to make.

FRANCES H. SEELEY, Principal P. S. 53, Queens:

1. No.

2. Simply because there are some principals who cannot be trusted with the privilege.

4. Personally, no different.

5. Yes, in a few cases.

6. Incurrigibles and truants should be more promptly dealt with and not left in a class, taking up time and attention of a teacher.

The parental home may help to solve this problem.

FRANK K. MONTFORT, Principal P. S. 57, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. I favor corporal punishment only if it could be restricted so as not to be abused. Its abuse is worse than its prohibition. There are individual cases where it does good not only to the child, but for the general discipline of the school. I write from experience. During nineteen years, I had the right to use corporal punishment. I can only recall five instances where I used it. It was effective in each case.

3. No person should have the right to inflict corporal punishment until some authority, higher than his own, has acted upon the individual case, and decided this form of punishment to be the proper remedy.

4. I believe discipline is better, but I believe this to be largely, if not entirely due to the better grade of teachers.

5. Yes.

CYRUS E. SMITH, Principal P. S. 58, Queens:

1. Decidedly, NO.

2. I am entering my forty-third year of school work. It took thirty years for me to learn that results arising from the infliction of corporal punishment are a delusion and far from satisfactory. Corporal punishment is corrective in appearance only. Only willing obedience is real obedience. Corporal punishment is suited to lazy principals. It is a quick and easy way to dispose of a bad boy. Corporal punishment is degrading, humiliating and brutal. Experience testifies that those given authority to inflict it are inclined to great severity and are usually lacking in self-control. Finally, I have never met a case where corporal punishment was inflicted that the mental and moral condition of the child was not lowered thereby, sometimes beyond redemption.

4. Much better.

5. I do not.

6. Use TACT. Tact is undefinable. Tact is possessed *by* and is peculiar *to* our best teachers. Without it management is a dead letter. The resourceful teacher is full of it. There are a thousand and one ways of disciplining a child without lacerating its flesh. 'No two cases requiring discipline are alike. No two persons to be disciplined are alike. Conditions vary. That which proves corrective and beneficial in one case becomes inadequate and harmful in another. Much wordly wisdom is necessary in order to manage children well. The child must be studied as an individual. Home conditions and life must be known. Common sense should largely abound, and the element of time should never be curtailed. Remember always that reformation comes through confidence and love; never through fear and hatred

KATE M. WESTBAY, Teacher in charge P. S. 61, Queens:

1. No.
2. (a) I consider corporal punishment degrading to the pupil who receives it and to the principal or teacher who administers it.
(b) It tends to lower a pupil's self-respect.
(c) It produces in the heart of the pupil so treated feelings of resentment, anger and hatred.
4. Better.
5. No.
6. I have obtained excellent results through being apparently blind to the faults of wayward boys, asking them to look out for and take care of the little boys outside the school room, recess, etc.; asking them to help me; giving them the impression that I trusted and respected them. It seldom happened that these boys did not begin to respect themselves and improve generally.

MARY E. MARKEY, Teacher in charge P. S. 62, Queens:

1. No.
2. Corporal punishment in the hands of a class teacher might not be wisely administered.
4. Since corporal punishment has never been used in this school, I could not answer this question.
5. I certainly do.
6. There should be some one with higher authority than the class teacher to whom incorrigible pupils could be sent for punishment.

J. WESLEY DRUMM, Principal P. S. 67, Queens:

1. Yes, if restricted.
2. If authority was given to principal, this fact would have a beneficial effect upon boys.
3. Spanking—done only by principal in office.
5. I think it does. If authority was given to principal only, it might not be necessary except in rare cases to exercise this authority.

FRANC C. ELLIS, Principal P. S. 68, Queens:

1. Yes.
2. (a) For the present and future good of the child.
(b) For the good of the class of which the child is a member.
(c) For the benefit of the parents of the child.
(d) For the benefit of the State or society of which this child will form a unit.

3. (a) The teacher is many times too tired and nervous to administer the well-deserved remedy.
- (b) A principal ought to be, and usually is, unbiased; therefore he or she would be the proper party to act. Each one has his or her method.
5. I do.
6. I am not opposed to corporal punishment.

MAURICE I. JEWELL, Principal P. S. 71, Queens:

1. Yes.
2. Children have respect only for those whom they fear.
In many cases nothing except physical pain appeals to the child.
Knowledge on the part of children that they can be punished is usually sufficient.
3. Punishment only by the principal or at his order in each case. The right given to the teacher only in individual cases. The form used to be left to the discretion of the principal.
4. Worse.
5. Yes.

ROBERT EADIE, Principal P. S. 72 and 73, Queens:

1. Yes.
2. A small number of pupils will not respond to kindness and sympathy, and cannot be influenced through parental co-operation because their parents either cannot or will not co-operate.

When such pupils willfully disturb a class and interfere seriously with the work of a teacher they can be appealed to only through fear of bodily discomfort. Fear, it is true, is not the highest motive to appeal to, but fear is an elemental constituent of human nature. Fear of undesirable consequences is a large determining factor in the management of affairs of adults, and in matters relating to conduct of children it serves a useful purpose when appeals to higher motives fail.

3. The parental way of bending a boy over the knee and applying a strap with moderate force to the most fleshy part of his body is as good a plan as any.

Corporal punishment should not be administered except as a last resort, when other means, including co-operation of parents, have failed. It should never be resorted to except for wilful disobedience and resistance of authority by a normal, healthy boy.

4. Since corporal punishment was abolished it has been more difficult to maintain discipline in the case of refractory pupils, and also in the case of average pupils when, through absence of the class teacher, the class was in the hands of a substitute.

5. I believe such knowledge does interfere with the proper maintenance of order and respect.

¶ The knowledge that wrong-doing can be indulged in with comparative impunity is a strong incentive to wrong-doing, both on the part of adults so disposed and of children.

¶ The knowledge that corporal punishment is permitted would in large measure render the resort to it unnecessary.

ANNA E. HULL, Principal P. S. 74, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. The principal possesses no requisite authority. No laws can be effective without a penalty attached. One or two *ringleaders* reasonably whipped would subdue a host of others who are less bold and defiant. Most children need nothing of the kind.

3. Whipped in the presence of the class teacher only.

4. Worse, every way.

5. Most decidedly so. Boys show in various ways that no one can control them. Reasoning they disdain, and expulsion is preferred, as it sets them at liberty. With almost every unruly boy the knowledge that he can be properly punished deters him from further misbehavior. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, a boy only needs to know that *he can be punished*. At present, the smallest child in school knows the teacher has no real control.

KATE R. HICKEY, Principal P. S. 76, Queens:

1. No.

2. It arouses the spirit of indignation and rebellion if used on a normal, healthy boy, and it is a great injustice to a defective boy.

4. We had not been using corporal punishment, therefore the knowledge of its abolition did not have any effect on the discipline.

¶ 5. I believe that it does in some cases.

WILLIAM H. CARR, Principal P. S. 79, Queens:

1. Yes.

2. I am not anxious to administer corporal punishment and rarely did administer it when I had a perfect right to do so.

¶ When it comes to a point where you either have to turn a boy into the street because of his misconduct or punish him and make him mind, I am of the opinion that he had better be punished.

I do not believe that a principal ought to be denied the right to use corporal punishment in a case like the above.

3. I would have corporal punishment administered by the principal only, after every other means of discipline had been tried and failed.

Corporal punishment to be administered only in aggravated cases for wilful and repeated offenses.

Teacher make a written complaint, principal investigate and make record. Principal report all cases to proper authorities.

4. Worse.

5. *Yes.* It is not so much that corporal punishment is needed, as it is the knowledge that it will be inflicted if absolutely necessary.

I do not believe that it is for the best interests of the schools to forbid corporal punishment when no other punishment will have any effect, and a boy is turned into the street to get rid of him.

JOHN J. DEMPSEY, Principal P. S. 80, Queens:

1. No, not as a practice; I believe occasionally it might do good.

2. *For:* Defiant children will fear, not respect, one who may punish. "The fear of the Lord," etc.

Against: Permission to use it, I believe, would lead to abuse of it, if the privilege was made general.

4. I never resorted to it, and was always able to discipline. A teacher who teaches well and interestingly never has trouble in discipline.

5. In many cases, especially where the parents "dare" teachers and principals to punish. It also is detrimental to the good order when a principal announces to the children that teachers must not punish.

It is just as well for the principal to have the authority, although he cares not to use it.

6. I would suggest that fathers or mothers come to school and give the deserving one a whipping. I know of two cases where this was miraculous in its effects.

Enforcement of "The Child Labor Laws" to the letter would help matters.

I would suggest the employment of more men teachers. Children's characters are left too much in the hands of women, who are more sentimental than just. All incorrigibles come from women's classes.

WILLIAM H. DUMOND, Principal P. S. 81, Queens:

1. *Yes.*

2. The pupils, in some cases, have no fear of anything except the fear of pain. Such pupils when suspended act as if a great honor were theirs.

3. In Amsterdam, N. Y., there used to be a rule that no corporal punishment should be inflicted except a third party were present. I dare say the presence of a witness would safeguard any form of corporal punishment.

4. Worse.

5. It does. If the question were allowed to die a natural death it would be far better for the schools.

If we are not to have corporal punishment restored, we surely can do better work if the question can be settled for a definite period.

JOHN D. MELVILLE, Principal P. S. 84, Queens:

1. No.

2. I believe that more harm than good results from the use of corporal punishment in the ordinary public school. Owing to its prohibition, teachers have learned better methods of teaching and better methods of handling children. Teachers have also learned to have better control of their own tempers. Moreover, we avoid the disgraceful scenes that not infrequently took place when incorrigible pupils, of violent temper, struggled with the man or woman inflicting the punishment. Even men of powerful build and pugilistic skill found it difficult to subdue some of the pupils who most needed physical coercion.

4. Better; and there is a far more friendly spirit between pupils and teachers.

5. Yes; but the harm done is less than the evils resulting from the use of corporal punishment.

6. I believe that pupils who cannot be controlled without the use of physical force by the school authorities should be speedily removed to special disciplinary schools where corporal punishment is sanctioned by the Board of Education and where military discipline is maintained. Cruelty should not be allowed in disciplinary schools, but the discipline should be severe. The ordinary public schools cannot be made too attractive, but the disciplinary schools should be thoroughly disliked by the pupils committed to them. Pupils sent to the disciplinary schools should not be retained long the first time, provided they show clear signs of repentance and give pledges to reform. Disciplinary schools should have in attendance expert medical men with authority to perform reformatory operations on the pupils.

BOROUGH OF RICHMOND

HIGH SCHOOL

H. F. TOWLE, Principal Curtis High School, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. I see no occasion for the use of corporal punishment in high schools; but it seems to me that in cases, relatively rare to be sure, no other treatment is equally effective where younger boys are to be dealt with. Of course, my views are based on theory, as I have had no experience in grammar grades for many years.

3. Should be administered by the principal only and then as a last resort. Have no suggestions as to methods.

4. No experience.

5. I do so believe, basing my opinion on talks with many principals.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

NATHAN J. LOWE, Principal P. S. 1, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. There are usually a very few pupils in every school to whom we can appeal, effectually, in no other way. Even one such pupil in a class causes a good teacher more nerve-strain than all her duties. We must tolerate these at the expense of the tone of the school or do them a lasting injury by suspending or expelling them.

3. My experience as a boy and as a teacher leads me to believe that a strap properly applied is the best. The sound as well as the sensation helps bring the mind in accord with the spirit of the school.

I believe it should be done by the principal or his assistant, and in the presence of the teacher. That a record of each case should be kept for the district superintendent and other school officers.

4. Worse.

5. There is no doubt of it. Teachers, parents and pupils say so. Some pupils come from homes where order and respect are not practised. Most of these really enjoy the order of the classroom and the restraint of the school, but there are a few who will not adapt themselves willingly to any government. You appeal in vain to the heart and head.

I have found that pupils who will not yield to the appeals of their teacher are cowardly, and the simple fact that corporal punishment may follow is sufficient in most instances.

G. J. JENNINGS, Principal P. S. 3, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. Question 5 answers this one very nicely. I think that if the pupils only knew that corporal punishment was allowed it would have an effect for good. It is not very often that I find it an advantage to use it, but once in a while I find a boy who needs it, and by all appearance *wants* it. When a boy really *wants* a thing of that kind he is usually dissatisfied until he gets it.

3. This question is rather difficult to answer for the reason that different cases require different treatment. About once or twice a year I find cases where a little old-fashioned "strap-oil" would be very effective. In most cases a little shaking by the collar has the desired effect. Again, I think if every school building had a *small* padded room in which to lock up a pupil who is willfully disobedient or unruly it would do away with much of the need of corporal punishment. I should not allow a teacher to use corporal punishment excepting under the direction and supervision of the principal.

4. Worse.

5. Yes.

HENRY F. ALBRO, Teacher in charge P. S. 4, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. As parents and teachers we owe it to the young, where all other punishments have failed. Everywhere in nature we see pain inflicted for violated law. This is meet and merciful, else one might gaze at the sun till he became blind.

3. Whipping on palm of the hand with an ordinary 12-inch ruler. Punishment inflicted by the teacher, preferably by the principal where the teacher does not feel strong enough.

4. Worse.

5. Yes. And where corporal punishment may be inflicted it is rarely necessary.

ANNIE E. COLE, Teacher in charge P. S. 5, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. Children seem to have the idea that *their* wishes or desires must be paramount, and openly exult in the idea "teacher daresn't touch me." Many children laugh at "moral suasion." In theory life in the schoolroom should be so conducted that nothing but good boys should be sent out in the world from it. In practice boys are very much like the boys of all ages—flesh and blood with spirits that need curbing to make them do right.

3. I do not care so much about using corporal punishment, but I am sure that if pupils know it *can* be used on absolutely necessary occasions it will inspire in them a wholesome respect for law. A good shaking may be sufficient to straighten out a wrong-acting boy for months. Punishment should come for open defiance of laws made for the welfare of all.

4. I have never made a practice of whipping, but have always studied to circumvent such cases. I have never taught where hoodlumism abounds, so cannot answer this question for myself. From those who have taught under such conditions I have heard them say it is worse to discipline.

5. I do, most decidedly.

LAURA K. CROUSEY, Teacher in charge P. S. 7, Richmond:

1. Yes; with certain restrictions.
2. Some of the older, rougher pupils can be restrained in no other way. Discipline should be maintained at any cost.
3. Only to be administered when other means have failed, then by the principal, as he thinks necessary.
4. Worse. Not in my own school, where I have not found it necessary.
5. Yes.
6. My experience has been so limited, in comparison with the larger schools, that I feel incompetent to suggest. I have never been obliged to resort to corporal punishment.

GEORGE HOGAN, Principal P. S. 9, 10, 11, 28, 29 and 33, Richmond:

1. No.
2. It will be too frequently abused. In seven cases out of every ten punishment (corporal) will be administered when not absolutely required or necessary. It is better that present conditions prevail rather than corporal punishment take place every day in the five hundred schools of New York City.
4. It is better. Teachers give more attention to good discipline; depend more upon themselves than upon the principal's rod.
5. In a few instances it may appear so, but in general, I think, pupils do not keep the fact in mind.

THOS. C. HARTY, Principal P. S. 12 and 32, Richmond:

1. Yes.
2. The use of the rod as a means of discipline should be strictly confined to the principal, and resorted to only as an extreme measure. The knowledge of this fact on the part of the pupils would, in a great measure, result in the practical abolition of corporal punishment.

3. Let the punishment be inflicted after due notice thereof has been sent to the parents, and in the presence of the class where the offense has been committed.

4. It has been worse, except in classes where the teacher has a strong personality and sympathetic nature.

5. Yes, because pupils frequently taunt their teachers with the threat of punishment in the courts if a hand is laid upon them. Not infrequently the parents themselves, in the presence of their children, will proclaim to both principal and teacher that they do not dare touch their children.

SHELDON J. PARDEE, Principal P. S. 13, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. If corporal punishment is not allowed there are those who will say "I can do as I am a mind to and you daren't touch me."

A good sound spanking is a wholesome tonic for a healthy wayward boy; and when deserved and properly administered is never treasured up by the boy against the principal.

3. Any reasonable form, preferably, perhaps, by switch or rattan. Some claim that a small rubber hose is best, but I cannot speak from experience.

Corporal punishment should be administered only after other usual remedies have been exhausted, and the parent given a hearing on the case before the principal. And I think it might be well also to have the boy and father before the district superintendent, unless it would burden the latter too much.

4. Worse.

5. I certainly do.

A. HALL BURDICK, Principal P. S. 14, Richmond:

1. Yes. The right to use will remove most of the need to use.

2. A few pupils in each school can be reached in no other way, especially by new teachers. Such pupils respect muscle or brute force and when they meet it they yield to it. The homes of such too often have slight or no disciplinary or corrective influence over them. Then should we waste time in vain efforts to morally persuade such pupils, when a good thrashing will save them? Should we allow a teacher's best efforts to be largely fruitless, her health undermined by worry causing sleepless nights, the rest of the class to lose the benefits to which they are entitled, because of such pupils when a judicious excitation of superficial nerves, or the knowledge that it can be done, would reach their intelligence and work a conversion of immense benefit to the sinners?

The child needs to learn that laws are to be obeyed, not defied; that defiance leads to punishment. He will need this knowledge in after life; he should learn it in school: it should be a practical part of his education for citizenship. We have to have new and inexperienced teachers and they must be sustained and aided in getting control of their new situations.

3. After the parent or guardian has been fully notified and consent obtained, if possible, and the nature of the offense fully explained to the pupil, then apply the blow with a strap, switch or rattan, about the fleshy parts of the body (or a spanking with a ruler). This is to be done by the principal, or by his assistant or the pupil's teacher with the consent of the principal and in the presence of the principal or assistant or another teacher, after school hours and not in the presence of the class or other pupils. The district superintendent should be promptly notified of each case.

Not to be used in kindergarten or with girls or for failure in lessons or recitations. Personal indignities, shaking, blows upon or about the head, lonely confinement, should be forbidden. If the parent will administer punishment and secure the desired discipline, the school should not give additional punishment.

4. It is difficult to say; for we have introduced pupil co-operation, and we never had much of corporal punishment. A certain class of cases are worse.

5. Yes. So much agitation of this question in the papers keeps them informed, and is a decided injury to good discipline. Parents tell me that the children tell at home that the teacher can do nothing with some pupil because she is not allowed to touch them. One father asked me to whip his boy because the boy had offensively declared at home that no one in the school dared touch him.

6. While I favor "the right to whip," I do not favor general or indiscriminate whipping.

Some form of pupil co-operation in the school government will greatly aid in securing good discipline. It gives the pupil an effective motive for controlling his own actions and not needing to be watched or punished.

Since we introduced, some three years ago, the "Ray" plan for pupil co-operation, we have had a continuous improvement in the pupils' self-control and self-direction for correct conduct and a lessening of the number of cases needing the straightening influence of the rod. I selected the "Ray" plan because it is simple and easily introduced, and so will be continued by the teachers; while, to me, the machinery of the "School City" plan seemed burdensome and so would soon be dropped.

J. J. DRISCOLL, Principal P. S. 15 and 16, Richmond:

1. No.

2. Its restoration would create a spirit of antagonism and introduce a discipline that would result in the majority of teachers' dependence on such form only.

4. In some respects better.

5. I believe it affects the conduct of a few boys in each school. My experience of thirty years has been entirely in one school and it has seemed so to me.

6. Greater power vested in district superintendents and principals.

S. McK. SMITH, Principal P. S. 17, Richmond:

1. Yes.
2. (a) It is a practical question; theory should weigh but little against the experience of the entire world to the present generation.
 (b) The effort to restrict and minimize it is worthy of the co-operation of all. Fear is perhaps the lowest motive toward good behavior.
 (c) But to assume that practically all parents and teachers up to the present time have been brutal and lacking in heart and in common sense is unjustifiable.
3. (a) Any safe form, *e. g.*, spanking.
 (b) I think we should return to common law conditions by rescinding the existing prohibition. I would lodge with principals and district superintendents the power to deprive any teacher of the right to resort to it, whenever the good of the service demanded it.
4. I had no experience in the elementary schools of New York City previous to abolition.
5. There is no doubt whatever on that point. Corporal punishment was permitted in Richmond Borough until February, 1902. Since it became known that the regulations prohibit it, pupils have been heard to encourage their mates in some mischief with "He (or she) can't hit you," or words to that effect. This state of things affects ignorant parents, who complain of trivial things; and in some instances I read of suits being brought which would be entirely without color of law, but for this regulation. In fine, it puts the earnest teacher on the defensive.
6. In the primary grades, in the case of pupils from homes without discipline, nothing can take the place of corporal punishment. Some of these quite small children are the most daring and hardened of all, going so far in fits of anger as to swear at and even to strike or throw stones at their teachers. Yet it becomes absurd and ridiculous to attempt to punish them by taking them before the district superintendent or to court, on account of their size. Among larger pupils an *efficient* means of transfer to an ungraded class or to an industrial school would be better.

T. F. DONOVAN, Principal P. S. 18, Richmond:

1. No.
2. I do not need it. I can govern my school without the use of the rod. It has no place in my school, but I know from personal experience it may be impossible to get along without it in some localities. When I began teaching in Richmond thirty-five years ago, had I not used the rod liberally I would have been compelled to resign. When the boys knew I was determined to be master of the situation, I had no further trouble. A wise, judicious, determined teacher or principal can get along without its use, except in very rare and extreme cases, such as determined and continued incorrigibility; then it is a matter for the civil authorities.

4. This question I cannot answer intelligently. It depends upon locality, condition of pupils, and their environments. I can only answer as to my own school. I think it is better.

5. I undoubtedly do. The publicity in the public press and the wide-spread agitation given this matter by the authorities and others have done more harm in maintaining discipline than the knowledge that corporal punishment has been abolished. While I am opposed to the use of corporal punishment in any form, still I feel it would do much good and be very helpful in keeping up a proper standard of discipline if it were known that the principal, and the principal only, had discretionary power; and it would have a very deterrent effect.

6. It may depend on conditions, localities and many other circumstances. What may be good for my school may not be suited to others. I believe the only case where corporal punishment should be used is for incorrigibility, and in those cases they should be treated as disorderly persons and committed to a truant school or some other such institution and the parents made responsible for the conduct of their children while in school. I also believe that in many cases where disciplinary measures have to be resorted to it is the fault of the teacher. If many principals and teachers would not so readily forget they were once pupils in the classroom themselves, they would not be so apt to notice many of the frivolous and childish pranks.

CHARLES F. SIMONS, Principal P. S. 19, Richmond:

1. No.

2. Very few people are fitted to administer it in the proper spirit, and when it is not done in such a spirit its effect upon the receiver is generally bad. It does not add to one's feelings of self-respect and self-control.

4. Better.

5. In very few cases it does.

SAMUEL VIERTTEL, Principal P. S. 21, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. As between bringing so-called incorrigible children before the courts where they are dealt with either leniently, showing the inefficacy of the law, or severely, showing the severity of law and corporal punishment, I should not hesitate to choose corporal punishment, which is both efficacious and not too severe.

A small percentage of children would be much improved by such punishment without the necessity of sending them to a reform or truant school, where they are often hardened to punishment of all sorts, and to crime by association with children as bad as or worse than themselves.

3. Any form of corporal punishment that might result in permanent injuries to the child should be barred. I cannot say just what form of it is best. That would vary with different children.

Punishment should be administered by the principal or some person to whom the power has been delegated by the principal. I should not allow any teacher to inflict such punishment.

4. The discipline of schools generally has improved since the abolition of corporal punishment, but not because of the abolition of such punishment. That can be accounted for by greater skill on the part of teachers in recent years and improved methods generally.

I think many children who are considered incorrigible would never be found so if corporal punishment were permitted.

5. I think so decidedly. In fact that is the worst feature of the law against corporal punishment.

6. As regards nine-tenths of the children, perhaps ninety-nine one-hundredths of them, corporal punishment is not necessary. For them almost any form of punishment permitted by the By-Laws will suffice. Especially so if judgment is passed on offenders by the pupils themselves through some form of self-government. The form of self-government can best be decided on by the principal. The indiscriminate use of corporal punishment I am decidedly opposed to.

In all cases where corporal punishment is thought of as a remedy the principal should be *absolutely sure* that the child's disorder is not due to any physical or mental ailment.

EDGAR W. ROBINSON, Teacher in charge P. S. 22, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. I have had about ten years' experience in schools where corporal punishment was used and about six where it was not. I have found discipline much easier where it *may* be used. It is not often that it needs to be used. It is the knowledge that it will be used if necessary that usually keeps the bad boy in place.

Most teachers will talk and coax and scold and give themselves nervous prostration before they will complain to their principal that they cannot control their class. Many times if they could give a troublesome pupil one good slap it would save more time and nerve force and do more good generally than all that can be done under existing circumstances. I know because I have seen it tried.

3. Usually in private.

4. Worse.

5. I know it does.

ELSIE GARDNER, Teacher in charge P. S. 24, Richmond:

1. No.
2. Corporal punishment is too dangerous a thing to be placed in the hands of a large body of teachers, many of whom are inexperienced.
It would often be used instead of a better way which required time and patience.
It is likely to be administered in anger.
It is the weapon of the weak teacher.
4. It has not been allowed within my experience.
5. It does.

LEWIS H. DENTON, Principal P. S. 25 and 26, Richmond:

1. No.
2. I believe that corporal punishment does not aid in the discipline of a school, and it is a very dangerous means of keeping order. It makes cowards of the pupils and fails to give the child any moral strength of character.
We must build character if we would make good citizens.
4. I have never found discipline difficult.
5. Not as a rule. Good teaching always commands respect.
6. Make each individual child feel that he is responsible for the discipline of the school. Create the proper "class spirit" of helpfulness, and hold each pupil responsible for his share of the work toward this end.
Expect nothing but the best and I believe the best will be given.

WM. B. RAFFERTY, Teacher in charge P. S. 30, Richmond:

To the Committee on Corporal Punishment:

In accordance with your invitation for my opinion on corporal punishment, I submit the following:

1. Do you favor corporal punishment in our schools? I do, in a modified form. I would restore the rod, but would not allow indiscriminate use of it. The right to inflict corporal punishment in extreme cases should be delegated to some person in each school.
2. This should be done in the interest of the majority of the pupils who are law-abiding and wish to do good work.
3. Every pupil that has had a hearing before district superintendent should be amenable to corporal punishment. I think rubber tubing is a good instrument to use.
4. Do you find discipline better or worse since the abolition of corporal punishment? I have found it more difficult. For the great majority of pupils the present methods of discipline are adequate, but for the one or two per cent. who are positively vicious something more than moral suasion is necessary.

5. Do you believe that the knowledge on the part of the pupils that no corporal punishment can be inflicted interferes with the proper maintenance of order and respect in schools? I am very sure that it does. There are many adults who refrain from wrong-doing through fear of punishment. The right to use the rod would go far toward doing away with the necessity of its use, and correct many of the present evils.

SUE S. MANEE, Teacher in charge P. S. 31, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. Nearly all children are punished in this way at home, and that is the only kind of punishment with them that will demand obedience and respect. All children should be taught the habit of doing right promptly. Observation shows that nearly all children brought up in this way make better citizens when adults.

3. It will not be necessary to punish often in this way if the children know the teacher or principal has the right to punish them.

I should use some form which could not injure the child, such as whipping with a switch, etc.

4. I believe it has made a decided change for the worse.

5. Anyone who has taught school *knows that it does* interfere.

I have never had much trouble with discipline, but I have found it much harder and the results less satisfactory.

6. There are some children who can only be reached through corporal punishment. It may be because we all belong to the animal kingdom, and when young that part of our natures generally predominates.

CHARLES W. SUTHERLAND, Teacher in charge P. S. 34, Richmond:

1. Yes.

2. There is no other punishment which will have desired effect so quickly or so effectively upon certain classes of pupils, especially those whose attendance is compulsory. Corporal punishment should be resorted to only as a *last* resort, however.

3. Whipping on back and legs with a small rubber hose, which does not leave marks, but has the requisite sting. This should be done only by the principal, or in his or her presence, and before at least two competent witnesses.

4. Decidedly worse.

5. Pupils openly boast that the principal dares not touch them.

There is no doubt of it whatever that this knowledge interferes with the good order and discipline of the classroom. The mere knowledge that the principal could whip, if necessary, would act as a deterrent in most cases, and thus the occasion for whipping would not occur.

REPLIES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OTHER CITIES

On December 7, 1907, the Special Committee addressed the following letter to the Superintendents of Schools in the larger cities of the United States:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,

Park Avenue and Fifty-ninth Street,

NEW YORK, December 7, 1907.

To the Superintendent of Schools.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned have been appointed a Special Committee by the Board of Education to inquire into and report whether the abolition of corporal punishment in the public schools of this city has been beneficial or detrimental in maintaining order and respect.

The Committee is desirous of obtaining information as to the policy pursued in other cities in respect to corporal punishment, and will be greatly obliged if you will answer the questions on the appended blank, adding thereto any suggestions which you may see fit to make on the subject.

Your early attention to this matter will be esteemed a favor, and a stamped and addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in replying.

Very respectfully yours,

NATHAN S. JONAS, Chairman,

DENNIS J. McDONALD, M. D.,

GEORGE A. VANDENHOFF,

Committee.

1. Do you believe in corporal punishment in public schools?
2. Please give reasons for or against.
3. Is corporal punishment practiced in the public schools of your city, and if so, under what restrictions?
4. If corporal punishment has been abolished, do you find the discipline better or worse since its abolition?
5. If corporal punishment has been abolished, does the knowledge on the part of the pupils that such punishment cannot be inflicted interfere with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the schools?
6. If you are opposed to corporal punishment, but believe that some other form of punishment should be devised to take its place for deterrent effect, please make suggestions.

(Sign here)

.....
Superintendent of Schools, City of.....

State of.....

The answers received are printed herewith, without repeating the foregoing questions.

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

CHAS. W. COLE, Superintendent of Schools, Albany, N. Y.:

1. No.

2. The decided improvement in good order in the classrooms, and the diminution in the number of cases of discipline, as well as the clearer moral atmosphere of the schools, are, in my opinion and in that of the great majority of our principals and classroom teachers, largely due to the abolition of corporal punishment in the year 1892. In view of these facts, derived from experience, it would seem hardly necessary to give theoretical arguments.

3. It is absolutely forbidden.

4. Far better.

5. In rare cases only. Such cases are disposed of in a special disciplinary school.

6. We are satisfied with present conditions.

W. L. STERLING, Superintendent of Schools, Albuquerque, N. M.:

1. I do.

2. In every community, so far as my experience has gone, I have found undisciplined children, with whom no argument prevails, save corporal punishment.

3. It is practiced to a limited extent.

Section 43 of our Rules and Regulations reads as follows:

"Corporal punishment shall be permitted only in extreme cases of discipline, after all milder means have failed. In every case of corporal punishment, the teacher inflicting the same must have some school employee to witness it.

6. In my judgment, corporal punishment can easily be overdone, and should be used only when brute force alone will suffice to curb the animal nature of the child. So long as mankind is partially under the domination of brute instincts, so long will it be necessary to apply physical force in correcting the evils brought to society by undisciplined characters. Speaking for myself, I would not accept the superintendency of a school under any circumstances if corporal punishment were absolutely prohibited. Not because I find it necessary, either personally or through my teachers, to frequently use it, but because the moral force carried by the fact of its possible use has such great influence over a body of pupils. After all, corporal punishment finds its strongest influence in its infrequency. But when absolutely necessary and all other means fail, its omission is a fatal blunder.

JOHN MORROW, Superintendent of Schools, Allegheny, Pa.:

1. Yes, when it is necessary.

2. Either corporal punishment should be permitted or outlaws should be immediately ejected from the school. I have no sympathy whatever with the namby-pamby policy that will tolerate one or more unruly pupils taking the time and energy of the teacher that ought to be devoted to the school. The decent children have some rights to be respected.

3. It is not much used in our city, but it is well understood that it will be resorted to if necessary. There are no restrictions. I would much prefer to have a separate school where all outlaws could be sent.

4. Many years ago it was abolished. This greatly increased the necessity for its use. The discipline was so bad that it was again restored.

5. Yes (see answer to the fourth question).

6. I think it would be much better to put incorrigible children in a school by themselves. After a hearing in which the offender and his parents, as well as the teacher, can be heard by the superintendent, the pupil is either given another chance to try to do better or he is sent to our truant school for truants and incorrigibles. This does away almost entirely with the necessity for corporal punishment and has a magic effect on the belligerent element all over the city. We have tested this plan for many years and it works well.

WILLIAM M. SLATER, Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Ga.:

1. Yes.

2. Children in the grammar schools are too young to be controlled entirely by reason. The home environment of many of them demands corporal punishment. Of course moral suasion will prevail usually with children in grammar grades.

3. Corporal punishment is practiced in the grammar schools of our city. If a parent is unwilling to have his child who is in the grammar grades corporally punished and if the child commits an offense requiring corporal punishment, under the rule the child is dismissed from school. Of course we do not have corporal punishment in the high schools.

4. Savannah, a city in our State, abolished corporal punishment for twenty-two years. I saw in the papers that the Board of Education recently unanimously returned to the system of corporal punishment.

5. I have no doubt that the abolition of corporal punishment puts the bad element of the school in the saddle, a condition to be deplored. Parents who govern their children have a right to such conditions in the school as will enable their children to learn and not be injured by loss of time caused by the unbridled rascality of bad children.

6. Moral suasion is the proper method for the overwhelming majority of children, perhaps 90 per cent. of them. Demerits are a valuable aid to discipline. Above all things the force of the teacher's personality must be the means of maintaining discipline. The displeasure of the ideal teacher is about the severest punishment that a boy or girl can receive.

JAMES H. VAN SICKLE, Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, Md.:

1. No.

2. Our teachers have become better teachers since they ceased to rely upon force. The best teachers have never needed to resort to corporal punishment.

3. No.

4. Better. Atmosphere of school more homelike. Teachers and pupils on better terms.

5. This was to some extent the case until ungraded classes were provided to which persistently disobedient pupils might be transferred.

6. Ordinarily we find that the ungraded class, with its small enrolment, its superior teacher and its opportunities for physical activity through manual training (which in these classes is a daily exercise), works the desired reform. In the few cases in which it fails to do this we transfer the troublesome pupil to another similar class at a greater distance from his home.

M. P. WHITE, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Boston, Mass.:

1. Yes.

2. To save the boy; to save the school; to save the community.

It should be used rarely and with judgment. The personality of the boy and not the nature of the offense to determine its necessity. Obedience and discipline, of so great importance in developing character, can be obtained from *certain characters in no other way*. Punishments look to future good; punishment means pain, physical pain no more degrading than mental pain.

3. Yes. To be given with a rattan, on the hand, not in the presence of the class, and only after the need and reasonableness of it have been explained to the offender.

HENRY P. EMERSON, Superintendent of Schools, Buffalo, N. Y.:

1. Personally, I do not believe in it.

2. You can't change the character or moral attitude of a child by beating him.

3. Yes, principals, and not teachers, are alone allowed to inflict it. The principal must report in writing at the end of each term the names and reasons.

4. It has not been abolished, but some principals do not resort to it.

6. Conference with parents for the purpose of securing their support, segregation of incorrigibles in separate rooms or buildings, suspension or expulsion. I know the matter is a difficult one to manage. I only know that I never resorted to corporal punishment when I was a principal.

R. G. YOUNG, Superintendent of Schools, Butte, Mon.:

1. Yes, when needed.

2. It is the only way of reaching those pupils whose home training has not been such as to make them respond to milder measures.

3. Yes.

(Rule of Board of Trustees)

"Corporal punishment of any description shall be resorted to only in extreme cases, when appeals to reason and affection have failed, and shall be inflicted by the principal, or in his presence, for sufficient cause and as a last alternative. BUT IN NO CASE SHALL THE PUNISHMENT BE INFLICTED IN THE PRESENCE OF A CLASS OR SCHOOL, nor shall such punishment be cruel or excessive; nor shall it be inflicted by blows upon or about the head or face, or any vital part, or by pinching, twisting the arms or hands, or by pulling the hair or ears."

HENRY O. WHEELER, Superintendent of Schools, Burlington, Vt.:

1. Yes. Where necessary. I believe a teacher should have the power to enforce obedience; if necessary, by corporal punishment.

2. Obedience is a matter of precise importance in a school—to the school and to the individual pupil. A teacher's authority should be commensurate with his responsibility. There are some pupils to whom nothing appeals so strongly as corporal punishment.

While I would discourage corporal punishment and would have it resorted to only with great discretion and in extreme cases, I would not prohibit it.

3. To a limited extent only. The teacher inflicting punishment is required to report the fact and circumstances to the superintendent.

4. It has not been abolished.

6. See answers to foregoing questions.

To repeat: A teacher should maintain proper discipline, and should have authority to resort to any reasonable means to accomplish this object.

The teacher's success will depend upon his discretion, and upon the manner in which the authorities stand by him.

WILLIAM C. BATES, Superintendent of Schools, Cambridge, Mass.:

2. Yes, under proper restrictions.

3. See blank enclosed:

(Blank)

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Office Superintendent of Schools

.....190

Mr.....

The following is the rule of the School Committee relating to corporal punishment:

"No teacher shall inflict corporal punishment in any form except by written permission of the superintendent. If the child persistently violates the rules of school, the superintendent may give authority to inflict such punishment for the remainder of any term, having sent notice to the parent or guardian."—*Rules of the School Committee, Sect. 75.*

*In compliance with this rule I notify you that
.....will be
liable to corporal punishment during the remainder of this term.*

It is hoped that his deportment will be such that there will be no occasion for punishment of any kind.

Very truly yours,

JAS. E. BRYAN, Superintendent of Schools, Camden, N. J.:

1. No.

2. Nine years' experience with corporal punishment and nine years' experience without have convinced me that the conditions that exist without it are preferable to those with it. The school has a stronger and higher influence, the teacher takes a higher position in the public mind, and the parent takes a higher view of the function of the school in the community. The pupil's respect for the school is likewise heightened.

Teachers grow stronger as a better grade of ability is required.

3. Not at all—prohibited by State Law for thirty years.

4. My knowledge of conditions in this State does not go back to the time of corporal punishment, but my experience in other States where it was permitted leads me to prefer the conditions we have here.

5. It crops out in isolated cases, but does not interfere in any real sense.

6. My experience leads me to believe that by far the majority of those cases that prove unmanageable under existing conditions are cases that require the removal of the child from the regular schools to a school-home, where his habits may be entirely changed.

Such a provision would also bring about more active co-operation of parents with the school management.

HENRY P. ARCHER, Superintendent of Schools, Charleston, S. C.:

1. I do.
2. Because it has been proven to be the best means of preventing disorder and insubordination.
3. It is, but it can only be administered by the principals.

S. S. STOCKWELL, Superintendent of Schools, Cheyenne, Wyo.:

1. In theory, no; in practice, sometimes.
2. In extreme cases the State has to resort to stringent means, so in school.
3. After consultation with the principal and then long deliberation.

EDWIN G. COOLEY, Superintendent of Schools, Chicago, Ill.:

1. No.
2. Unnecessary and brutal.
3. No.
4. Better.
5. I think not.

F. B. DYER, Superintendent of Schools, Cincinnati, O.:

1. Yes, before the age of adolescence.
2. Bagley in his "Class Management" pretty well expresses my views, in his discussion of the formative period, before the age of 14.
3. Yes, in presence of witness, for extreme insubordination, as a last resort. Blows only on the body. Full report, naming the instrument used, etc., made to the superintendent.

WM. H. ELSON, Superintendent of Schools, Cleveland, O.:

1. No and yes.
2. The legal privilege to use it should be given. In practice it should be avoided.
3. No, except in rare cases of violation of the rule governing the same.
4. The discipline is not unfavorably affected by it. On the contrary, less antagonism is manifested both on the part of pupils and teachers than under the rules permitting it.
5. Not perceptibly. Perhaps the right to whip given under State law aids in avoiding such tendency. Ours is a case where the law permits it but the Board rules forbid it.
6. We have almost no trouble in matters of discipline in the case of girls. We have a boys' school for incorrigibles. This is a great aid to discipline. I do not oppose corporal punishment administered wisely, but that is unthinkable in a large corps of teachers and great abuses arise. In many cases the teacher is unfavorably affected by the right to use corporal punishment, and becomes arrogant, thereby inviting trouble.

J. W. CARR, Superintendent of Schools, Dayton, O.:

1. Yes; but believe it should be used very sparingly.
2. If judiciously used, it makes far better discipline. For most children it is enough to know that teachers have the *right* to administer corporal punishment. There is a class of pupils that a good dressing does positive good. If corporal punishment is not permitted, there is frequently nothing to do but turn them out. So long as the policemen's club is necessary to maintain order in society, the schoolmasters' rod is needed in the school.
3. Yes. Left to discretion of principals and teachers. Each case is reported to Superintendent of Instruction. We have about twenty cases per month—about 15,000 pupils in school.

CHARLES E. CHADSEY, Superintendent of Schools, Denver, Col.:

1. I believe that the *power* to inflict corporal punishment should be possessed, but very seldom exercised.
2. The knowledge that corporal punishment *may* be inflicted is in certain cases salutary. The knowledge that the teachers do not possess the right to inflict it is in certain cases detrimental.
- "3. Corporal punishment shall never be inflicted until after consultation with and approval of the principal."—Rule XV, Sec. 14.
- "In all cases of corporal punishment or suspension, the parents and superintendent must be promptly informed by letter, stating the case in full."—Rule XV, Sec. 16.
6. I believe in it only after all other methods have failed. In all cases where possible the consent of the parent should be obtained before corporal punishment is inflicted.

W. C. MARTINDALE, Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Mich.:

HON. NATHAN S. JONAS,

DETROIT, Dec. 9, 1907.

Department of Education,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have sent you by to-day's mail a copy of the manual of the Detroit Board of Education showing the rules governing Detroit public schools. The condition here in regard to the matter mentioned is quite satisfactory.

In reply to your request for an opinion regarding corporal punishment, permit me to say that as a teacher I believe in corporal punishment; as a principal I doubted its efficacy or justification; as a superintendent I do not believe in corporal punishment. However, from the standpoint of teacher and principal, it may be best to occasionally administer it.

Very sincerely,

W. C. MARTINDALE,

Superintendent.

DUTIES OF TEACHERS.

88. It shall be the duty of teachers to practice such discipline in their schools as would be exercised by a wise and judicious parent in his family—always firm and vigilant, but prudent.

89. They shall endeavor to impress upon the minds of their pupils the principles of morality and virtue, a sacred regard for truth, sobriety, industry and frugality, but no teachers shall exercise any sectarian influence in the school.

90. All teachers are enjoined to avoid a resort to punishment, and especially corporal punishment, whenever consistent with safety to the maintenance of good order and right conduct on the part of pupils.

91. Those teachers who are most successful in controlling their pupils without resort to corporal punishment, other qualifications being sufficient, shall be awarded by the board a higher degree of appreciation.

92. Teachers are required:

- (a) To adhere strictly to the rules of the Board of Education, and, in all cases of doubt to seek advice of the principal or superintendent.
- (b) To be kind and courteous to their pupils, and to require from them prompt obedience, courtesy and politeness.
- (c) To avoid corporal punishment in all cases in which milder measures can be successfully employed, and never to inflict it without the full knowledge and consent of the principal.
- (d) To avoid all appearance of indiscreet haste in matters of discipline, to seek in more difficult cases the direction and advice of the principal or the superintendent, and to send no pupil home from school without the knowledge and consent of the principal.
- (e) To keep a correct and full record of all cases of corporal punishment upon the page of the summary book devoted to the purpose, remembering that any infliction of bodily pain for the purposes of discipline is to be considered corporal punishment, and to report this record at the end of each month to the Superintendent.

W. E. HOOVER, Superintendent of Schools, Fargo, N. D.:

1. Yes.
2. It's a good thing to have in the family *when it is needed to use it*.
3. Yes. In most cases after conference with parent.

W. A. GREESON, Superintendent of Schools, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

1. No; not if it can be avoided. My opinion is, however, that it would be most unwise to declare publicly that under no circumstances will a child be punished.

2. My reasons against corporal punishment are that it is so repugnant to the general public feeling that I advise teachers never to inflict corporal punishment except in extreme cases.

3. Occasionally there is a case of corporal punishment in our schools, but not often. Whenever a child is punished the principal reports the matter to the superintendent, giving the facts of the case in detail.

4. It would not be correct to say that corporal punishment has been abolished in Grand Rapids schools, but practically we have very few cases of corporal punishment, and I do not think that the discipline has been injured thereby.

5. I have answered this question under Question 1. I feel very sure that if pupils were to be told that they would not be punished under any circumstances it would have a very bad effect upon the discipline of the school.

6. I do not think it would be wise to devise any form of punishment. It seems to me that discipline is a personal matter between the teacher and the pupil, and that a teacher should be left quite free to obtain results in her own way. My own observation is that the less said about punishment the better.

THOS. S. WEAVER, Superintendent of Schools, Hartford, Conn., transmitted the following extract from the rules on discipline:

SEC. 6. Teachers shall seek, in all cases, to govern their scholars by moral means; but, in cases where such means, faithfully used, fail to produce reformation, the principal may administer corporal punishment.

SEC. 7. The principal of each graded school shall have charge of the order, discipline, and arrangement of studies therein, and each subordinate teacher shall be responsible to the principal, and see that his instructions in reference thereto are faithfully observed.

SEC. 8. Whenever the example or influence of any scholar shall become injurious to a school, and reasonable efforts for reformation have proved unavailing, it shall be the duty of the principal to inform the parent or guardian, and, in case no improvement is then secured, it shall be the duty of the principal to report the case of such scholar to the district committee for suspension or expulsion.

C. N. KENDALL, Superintendent of Schools, Indianapolis, Ind.:

December 11, 1907.

MY DEAR SIR: Our rules relative to corporal punishment in Indianapolis are as follows:

"Teachers shall avoid corporal punishment when good discipline can be preserved by milder means. Such punishment shall be inflicted in the presence of the principal, but not in the presence of the school. Each

teacher shall make out a full and complete statement in writing of each case in which corporal punishment has been administered by him upon any pupil, specifying the name, age and grade of the pupil punished, the offense charged, and the kind and degree of punishment inflicted, and the name of every person who witnessed such punishment; which statement shall be given to the principal to be forwarded by him immediately to the superintendent of schools."

Very truly yours,

C. N. KENDALL,

Superintendent of Schools.

JAS. Q. PALMER, Superintendent of Schools, Jacksonville, Fla.:

1. Yes.

2. The majority of teachers could not control their pupils if it was known that no corporal punishment was allowed (speaking from my experience alone).

3. Yes. The principal alone is authorized to administer and is required to report all such cases to the superintendent.

HENRY SNYDER, Superintendent of Schools, Jersey City, N. J.:

1. No.

2. Unnecessary. Control is better without it. Brutal. Governs by fear, not by love.

3. No. Forbidden by State law.

4. As it has been prohibited for many years the comparison might be regarded as unfair, because it might imply that all improvement in discipline is due to the abolition of corporal punishment.

A better comparison could be made between the discipline of the schools of this State and that of others. I believe the comparison would be favorable to the former.

It is certain that the discipline has constantly grown better.

5. Very rarely.

6. Insistence upon co-operation of parent, if there be any.

In extreme cases reference to juvenile court.

As last resort assignment to special schools, etc., etc.

I should not now favor the use of corporal punishment, even if the law permitted it.

M. E. PEARSON, Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, Kansas:

1. No, indeed.

2. It is not right; it is not wise; it is not pedagogical; public opinion will not sustain it.

3. Corporal punishment is practiced in our city to a very limited extent. It is administered only by consent of parent and under the direction and advice of the principal.

4. Its abolition has improved the discipline and increased the respect of patrons and pupils and public for our public schools.

5. I think it would be very unwise for a board of education to make a law and publish it to the effect that teachers should not administer corporal punishment under any circumstances. The better judgment of the teachers should prohibit corporal punishment, not any formal law.

6. Our plan is a rule of the Board of Education permitting corporal punishment under wise restrictions, a clear understanding in the mind of every teacher that the management of the schools does not endorse corporal punishment, does not believe in it and will not condone it except in extreme and urgent cases. Under these restrictions corporal punishment has been practically abolished in our schools. Yet every pupil and patron understands clearly that teachers have the power and that, if there is any attempt to take advantage of the absence of corporal punishment, teachers may inflict the same.

G. D. THORPE, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, Mo.:

1. Only as a final resort.

3. Permit from parents necessary. Punishment must be inflicted in presence of not less than two witnesses and never in presence of the school.

5. I think that it would weaken the discipline in some cases where teachers were not the *strongest*.

B. W. TORREYSON, Superintendent of Schools, Little Rock, Ark.:

1. Yes.

2. Some teachers are unable to manage some children in any other way.

3. Consent of parent and principal must be obtained.

6. Can suggest no specific substitute. In my opinion the only remedy is the employment of stronger teachers *if they can be found*.

E. C. MOORE, Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles, Cal.:

1. In the extreme cases.

2. I believe that corporal punishment should not be abolished, but should not be used. It is nearing a vanishing point in Los Angeles. With an attendance in all of 35,000 we had but 254 whippings last year, and the number grows much smaller each year.

3. The whipping must be administered in the presence of the principal or another teacher.

6. In principle I am opposed to corporal punishment and have no doubt that other forms of punishment can be used to much better advantage in almost all cases. It is a matter of last resort only, but its historic efficacy cannot be denied in extreme cases.

E. H. MARK, Superintendent of Schools, Louisville, Ky.:

1. Yes, if properly restricted.

2. There are very few cases in our schools requiring the use of corporal punishment. As a rule this punishment is resorted to in too trivial cases and many times when the one administering it is angry.

3. "RULE 3. All teachers must aim at such discipline in their school as is practiced by a kind, judicious parent in his family.

"Corporal punishment shall be resorted to after all other means of discipline fail. But before it shall be administered the written consent of the parent must be obtained and a full written history of the case must be filed with the principal by the teacher, and a copy of the same must be sent to the superintendent. The punishment can only be administered by the principal in his office. The principal shall report all cases of corporal punishment to the superintendent at the time the report of enrollment and attendance is made. In no case shall resort be had to confinement in closet or wardrobe, or to other cruel or unusual punishment, as a mode of discipline. Pupils shall not be required to copy any part of any text-book or to write any word or sentence a great number of times as a punishment."

ARTHUR K. WHITCOMB, Superintendent of Schools, Lowell, Mass.:

1. As permissible under some circumstances, yes.

2. In my own work as master of a large grammar school I found that the right to use corporal punishment in extreme cases was a great help, but I made great efforts to avoid making any use of the privilege. In my last teaching I did not, indeed, inflict corporal punishment at all. Now, just what I found valuable for myself I wish my masters and teachers to have, but I hope they will very rarely feel compelled to use the form of punishment named.

The good of the pupil is subserved in most cases, not by sending him out of school, the only possible substitute for corporal punishment in extreme cases, but by making him behave in school. In this view most parents concur heartily.

3. The rules of the school committee provide that all discipline shall be parental in its character, which is interpreted to mean that anything which a parent may properly do to secure respect, attention and obedience the teacher may also do. This is held to include corporal punishment, but the rules further restrict this by forbidding its use until all other means have failed. Records, open to the superintendent and school committee, must also be kept of all cases, if there are any.

4. Not abolished.

CHARLES W. BICKFORD, Superintendent of Schools, Manchester, N. H.:

1. I believe that teachers should have power to inflict corporal punishment as a last resort.
2. Because all natures are not alike, and what will inhibit injurious practices in one case will not inhibit them in another. And this, *solely*, is the aim of punishment.
3. Yes, as a last resort. A record of the offense, method and extent of punishment is filed in the superintendent's office upon a blank provided for that purpose. Punishment may be inflicted only at close of session.

I. C. McNEILL, Superintendent of Schools, Memphis, Tenn.:

1. Yes, under close restriction.
2. Appeals must sometimes be made to physical pain. We recognize that physical pain is a negative method of reaching good discipline.
3. Corporal punishment of pupils shall be administered only by principals.

C. G. PEARSE, Superintendent of Schools, Milwaukee, Wis.:

1. I do not believe in using it very much; I do not believe in any rule that makes it impossible when it seems necessary.
2. There is usually some better way; occasionally, under present conditions, more or less unskilled teachers, number of pupils in a class, and pressure of other work, such punishment is the lesser of two evils—better than lawlessness and disorder.
3. When considered necessary; inflicted only by principal, in presence of teacher.
5. This is true in some cities where it has been abolished.

CHAS. M. JORDAN, Superintendent of Schools, Minneapolis, Minn.:

1. Sometimes.
2. Should not be inflicted if any other way can be found. If not, it should be.
3. Allowed if parents give written consent.
4. We find little difference.
5. In some cases—not generally.

S. S. MURPHY, Superintendent of Schools, Mobile, Ala.:

1. Yes, for boys.
2. There are certain boys in every school who require punishment, and corporal punishment, judiciously administered, tends to hold in check such pupils.

3. Yes, for boys; administered by principal only and after school closes. Optional with pupil whether he takes punishment or not, but must take the punishment before he can return. Not resorted to until all other means have failed.

6. I am not, when other means have been tried and failed. A large per cent. of pupils never need corporal correction and with some nothing, in my opinion, takes its place.

H. C. WEBER, Superintendent of Schools, Nashville, Tenn.:

1. Yes.

2. There comes a time, no matter how long deferred, when the will of the child is rebellious to authority and no argument seems to reach the case. It then become necessary to resort to one of two expedients—either corporal punishment or exclusion. Did a teacher's duty end with teaching only those of a community that were willing to obey the rules, it would indeed be a pleasant calling. But is not a teacher's duty to hold in school and teach those very refractory pupils respect for regularly constituted authority? When the millennium comes and teachers are perfect, possibly then corporal punishment can be abolished without resorting to the dangerous expedient of exclusion from school. However, the Master, who is perfect, found it necessary to teach a system of punishment for wrongdoers.

3. Yes. After conference of the teacher and principal the child may be punished by the principal, or he may direct the teacher to inflict such punishment as he deems necessary.

4. It never was abolished in these schools.

5. Since corporal punishment has not been abolished here I cannot answer from practical experience. My opinion, however, is decidedly, yes.

6. I am opposed to corporal punishment, but know of no substitute except exclusion from school, which I regard as a very dangerous expedient. Corporal punishment should be reduced to the minimum, or abolished by the cause being reduced to the minimum or being made to disappear.

A. B. POLAND, Superintendent of Schools, Newark, N. J.:

1. No.

2. Impossible to prevent its abuse. Corporal punishment depends for its efficient motive upon fear, instead of interest, sympathy and love. Admitting that corporal punishment is the best remedy in a few cases, the number is too small to warrant its use in any case. Other means, as parental classes, ungraded classes, reform schools and similar agencies, enable us to provide for exceptional children. Where corporal punishment is needed it should be administered at home.

3. It is not.

4. Much better.

5. Very rarely.

6. I would suggest as a better deterrent increased effort on the part of principals and teachers to make the children love to go to school. If this effort fails, as it will in occasional cases, the pupil must be sent to an ungraded class, parental school, reform school or some separate institution. The number of pupils who need to be segregated from others should not exceed two in a thousand. Such pupils need separate care and training.

I am of the opinion, however, that the best deterrent is the teacher who loves the pupils and is deeply interested in their welfare.

F. H. BEEDE, Superintendent of Schools, New Haven, Conn.:

1. Yes.

2. I believe that, on the whole, prompter, better and more permanent school order and school work can be obtained by the judicious use of corporal punishment than by its abolition. Defiance and insolence with a certain class of boys are likely to follow its abolition.

3. Yes. Teacher must not punish without consent and approval of principal.

Witness must be present.

Punishment must not be in presence of school.

Must be used only in extreme cases.

Corporal punishment is allowed, but its frequent use is strongly discouraged. Teachers are expected to try all moral means first.

Extract from the Rules and Regulations of the Public Schools of the City of New Orleans, La.:

ARTICLE VII

SEC. 5. *Corporal Punishment.* For continual violation of rules by male pupils, after all appeals to reason and affection have failed, the principal, or assistant by authority of the principal, has the right to inflict corporal punishment, provided that said punishment be not inflicted in the presence of any class, or pupil, or at the time offense was committed. The mode of punishment shall be upon the hands.

JOHN R. WILSON, Superintendent of Schools, Paterson, N. J.:

1. No.

2. It lowers the dignity of the teacher or principal who uses it. It develops the coarser nature of the child.

Many children are physically unable to stand corporal punishment.

3. No.

4. Corporal punishment was abolished in the schools of Paterson twenty-five years ago.

I have heard this matter discussed very often by people who were connected with our schools before corporal punishment was abolished, and my impression is that discipline, since that time, has been decidedly better.

5. No.

6. Establish central schools to which troublesome pupils may be sent. Make the hours in such schools considerably longer than in other schools, and make the work more difficult.

If necessary, have pupils brought before a Juvenile Court to be sentenced to these schools.

GERARD T. SMITH, Superintendent of Schools, Peoria, Ill.:

1. In extreme cases. I do not believe in a law positively prohibiting it.

2. Teacher in schoolroom stands in place of parent, and it has a bad effect both on pupil and some parents to feel that teacher must under all circumstances keep "hands off."

3. Yes; but only in presence of the principal, or more commonly the principal punishes the pupil when corporal punishment is necessary. We have very few cases, however, and they are gradually diminishing.

C. HENRY KAIN, Associate Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, Pa.:

1. No.

2. Where corporal punishment is allowed the abuses are likely to be so great as to overbalance any possible good that might result. There are reflex influences upon both teacher and pupils which are undoubtedly bad. No teacher or principal can administer corporal punishment to a pupil and then go calmly on with the regular duties of the school-room. The resulting disturbance of the teacher's mind must inevitably affect the character of the recitations which succeed.

3. Very little. Although there is no law or rule of the Board of Education which prohibits it, yet the public sentiment is against it, and only few principals believe in it. In schools where it is still practised the discipline is notably poorer than in the other schools.

4. The discipline is distinctly better in schools where corporal punishment is not used.

My opinion is based upon personal experience. When I began teaching in New Jersey corporal punishment was in vogue everywhere. Like all others I made free use of the rod. After an experience of about two years I began to realize that the use of corporal punishment was causing me to have a noisy and unsatisfactory school. I tried to trace the cause of this, and became satisfied that it was ascribable to the use of corporal punishment. After punishing a child I found I was irritable; the sympathies of the children were usually with the culprit who had received punish-

ment, and the disturbed condition prevented the accomplishing of calm, good work. After mature reflection I gave up corporal punishment absolutely, and have never had occasion to regret my decision.

5. I think not.

6. I am not among those who believe that corporal punishment should *never* be used. There are cases in which it would seem to be proper, but in all such cases the *parent* is the proper one to administer it.

It is not possible to lay down definitely some form of punishment which can take the place of corporal punishment. Children are so different in temperament, etc., that sometimes the simple withdrawal of the teacher's confidence is sufficient. Sometimes a short detention after school may serve the purpose.

This statement is undoubtedly true: Schools which are managed with a minimum of punishment are better than those in which punishments are frequent.

W. H. BROWNSON, Superintendent of Schools, Portland, Me.:

1. Yes.

2. In Portland we reduce corporal punishment to its lowest possible terms. It is used only as a last resort when other means fail. In the districts where we have the most unruly boys an extreme case would mean either corporal punishment or expulsion from school. By the former we are often able to keep the boy in school two or three years longer than we could without it, and this seems worth while. There might be some teachers who could maintain discipline in such schools if the boys understood that they could not be whipped, but the average teacher would find herself unable to properly govern her pupils without resort to frequent expulsion.

3. In our most crowded schools corporal punishments amount to something like one-half of one per cent. of the pupils. Principals report to the Superintendent each case, with reasons therefor, and the severity and nature of the punishment. Public opinion supports the use of corporal punishment to the extent that it goes in this city.

4. For an answer to this question do not fail to get an opinion from Superintendent Walter H. Small, of Providence, R. I. Ask for the substance of an address given before the New England superintendents in Boston one year ago.

5. Superintendent Small says yes.

W. H. SMALL, Superintendent of Schools, Providence, R. I.:

1. Under proper restrictions, yes.

2. There are times in a boy's life when physical pain only seems to bring him to himself and his relations to others. It is at these rare times that it should be used.

3. In primary grades on the written consent of parents. Not allowed in grammar grades, but very troublesome pupils are removed to disciplinary schools, where corporal punishment is used without restriction.

5. It would, if pupils did not know there was a "court of last resort" in the disciplinary school.

WM. F. FOX, Superintendent of Schools, Richmond, Va.:

1. Yes. I believe that other means of discipline as far as practicable should be used, but there seems to come a time when nothing will answer except the rod.

2. See above.

3. Yes; but the whipping must be given in the office of the principal and in the presence of a witness.

4. As it has not been abolished I cannot say what the result would be, but our best teachers are securing better discipline without it, or with its rare infliction.

5. See above. We have not observed any deterioration in discipline since the restrictions have been placed around it.

6. As stated above, I think it unwise to take away the power of using the rod, but we are constantly endeavoring to diminish its use.

C. F. CARROLL, Superintendent of Schools, Rochester, N. Y.:

1. I do not.

2. I do not believe in corporal punishment because I believe there is a better method of governing children. In the very best disciplined schools in our city no corporal punishment is ever administered. You will infer from this that we have not formally abolished corporal punishment, though it is rapidly disappearing under the influence of public sentiment.

4. Indefinitely improved by its abolishment.

5. Never.

6. I have no suggestion to offer. The matter of discipline is amply provided for when the children are kept busy with a proper variety of work, and when the pupil and teacher together have common interest.

From the Superintendent of Schools, San Antonio, Tex. (unsigned):

1. Yes.

2. We should employ the highest motive that will move. Corporal punishment in school often saves the pupil from capital punishment in later life, or from a penitentiary service.

3. Yes; theoretically, and usually in practice, after securing the consent of the parent.

A. RONCOVIERI, Superintendent of Schools, San Francisco, Cal.:

1. Yes.

3. Girls and all pupils of high schools exempt. Boys of primary and grammar grades subject thereto. Experience has demonstrated its utility and efficacy.

4. It was partially abolished some years ago and the discipline declined.

From the Superintendent of Schools, Seattle, Wash. (unsigned):

1. Yes; to a limited extent.

2. There are some cases which corporal punishment, properly administered, will reach, and no other means seems to be effective.

3. From the Rules of the Seattle Public Schools:

"Excessive or unusual punishments shall not be inflicted. Corporal punishment shall not be administered by any teacher except in cases of flagrant offenses, and when other less severe modes of discipline have failed to reform a pupil. It shall never be inflicted until after consultation with and approval of the principal. In no case is it to be administered in the presence of the school, but always in the presence of some other teacher, preferably the principal, and generally at the close of the session.

"Each teacher shall file with the superintendent and principal a written statement of the circumstances attending each case of corporal punishment, the same day or that following on which it is given."

J. A. WHITEFORD, Superintendent of Schools, St. Joseph, Mo.:

1. Yes, for cases where other remedies will not avail.

2. See extracts from report to Board attached. In my opinion it is not a specific for every ill, and its use often does harm. However, it is very much like a well-conducted home. A father should not tell his boys that he dares not switch them if they need it, although he may never have occasion. He should not say what might happen, but leave them to think he is the head of the house.

3. Yes, but by advice and consent of principal; never in the presence of other children. Parents may administer same if they choose. Board prescribes instrument used, and complete report is made to superintendent and filed with the Board. See enclosed form.

(Extract from Report to Board)

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

"The records of the year show that there were 1,182 cases of corporal punishment. By reference to last year's record, I find that there were 2,182 cases, showing a decrease of 1,000 for the year just closed. In my

judgment, the discipline of the schools was in nowise injured by this showing. In some of the rooms not a single case of corporal punishment was reported for the year, and I do not hesitate to say that in these rooms the order was even better than in those where corporal punishment was most frequent. It is not my purpose to say that the system should be abolished, neither do I wish to recommend it as a sole remedy for discipline in the schools. The courts have time and again recognized the right of the teacher to administer this mode of punishment, and I believe it is most effective in dealing with certain characters when other means have failed. The rod was never intended as a specific for the treatment of all school troubles. It is rather a reserve force to meet the emergencies that necessarily arise in school work. In the home the right of the parent to administer just reproof and punishment is not questioned. Neither is it best for the children to once think that strenuous means will not be used, if necessary. The same conditions apply to the school."

RECORD OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

.....School

RULE 70—Each Principal and each assistant teacher shall make out and preserve a full and complete statement in writing of each case in which corporal punishment shall be inflicted by him or her upon any pupil, specifying the name, age, and grade of the pupil, the offense charged, and the kind and degree of punishment inflicted, which statement shall be kept open for inspection in the respective rooms of the teachers during the month, and be returned by the Principal, with his or her regular monthly report at the close of each school month to the Superintendent for examination by the Board.

I hereby certify that the following is a complete list of corporal punishments inflicted by me during the month ending.....190....

(Signed)

Teacher

[illegible]

F. LOUIS SOLDAN, Superintendent of Instruction, St. Louis, Mo.:

St. Louis, *December 9, 1907.*

Hon. NATHAN S. JONAS,

Chairman Special Committee,

500 Park Avenue, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of December 7th, I beg to say that corporal punishment is allowed under the regulations of the Department of Instruction, but its use is not encouraged. If inflicted, it must be with the sanction of the principal and in the presence of both teacher and principal.

In answer to your specific questions:

Q. Do you believe in corporal punishment in public schools?

A. I believe it proper in exceptional cases where all other means have failed and where the choice is between corporal punishment and driving the child out of school.

Q. Please give reasons for or against.

A. Implied in my answer to first question.

Q. Is corporal punishment practised in the public schools of your city, and if so, under what restrictions?

A. It is practised to a limited extent, there being about 700 cases last year with an enrolment of nearly 90,000 children.

Respectfully yours,

F. LOUIS SOLDAN,

Superintendent.

S. L. HEETER, Superintendent of Schools, St. Paul, Minn.

December 9, 1907.

Mr. NATHAN S. JONAS,

New York City.

DEAR SIR: At the beginning of my administration in the St. Paul schools, in September, 1906, I found a rule that had been announced and followed for several years, prohibiting all forms of corporal punishment in public schools. It had become so generally known among the students that many boys would publicly defy teachers and principal, and as the city had had no truant or parental school and no detention home at that time, boys were expelled in large numbers for acts of insolence and impudence, allowed to run the streets, become boy tramps, and swell the rank of child laborers; all of whom should have been kept in school and forced to respect authority.

I do not believe in free-handed use of corporal punishment, and I doubt the wisdom of granting the privilege of corporal punishment to teachers;

but I do believe that such privilege should be given to principals, to be used in extreme cases.

With these facts in mind, a year ago, the Board of Education passed a rule authorizing a principal to use corporal punishment where the written consent of the parents was secured in advance. Principals were required to report all cases of corporal punishment to the Superintendent of Schools. Less than a score of cases have been reported, but the rule announced publicly by the Board did a world of good, in that it gave boys to know that there was authority in the schools to handle them bodily, if the case warranted the same.

No boy should be punished corporally for any first offense, and the conduct of a boy in school should be studied, and the needs of corporal punishment anticipated, so that teachers and principal may apply to the parents for written consent to discipline a child by the use of corporal measures as a last resort.

I am very much pleased with the result obtained by this rule.

Respectfully yours,

S. L. HEETER,

Superintendent.

A. B. BLODGETT, Superintendent of Schools, Syracuse, N. Y.:

1. No.
2. Brutalizing and unsafe.
3. No; not for past thirty years.
4. Better.
5. No.

C. L. VAN CLEVE, Superintendent of Schools, Toledo, Ohio:

1. Yes, as a last resort.
2. On the whole I may say that with my most skilful teachers there is little or no recourse to extreme measures in discipline, but no school superintendent can have a corps of teachers of equal skilfulness. My fundamental principle is that the child has an inalienable right to be controlled; the milder the methods employed the better, but it is a crime against childhood to permit it to grow up unregulated, and where reasonable reproof and mild measures do not bring reform, I believe that corporal punishment is justifiable to bring about the child's subjection to reasonable restraint.

3. Except as a means for self-protection, which sometimes is necessary in turbulent districts, no teacher is permitted in the city of Toledo to strike a child in such a manner as to inflict an indignity upon him. By that I mean boxing of ears, or slapping or striking with any sort of an

implement the hands or fingers of a child, or any unusual form of punishment is absolutely and rigorously prohibited. No case of corporal punishment is to be inflicted against any child until after the case has been considered by the principal, and in every such case the principal's permission for the punishment must first be secured. Our city is not so large but that a switch may be secured for this purpose, and when necessary to inflict corporal punishment, I have insisted that no other implement be used.

6. In the State of Ohio we have juvenile court officials who deal with incorrigibles under the name of juvenile disorderly persons. Under the operation of this court parents may be fined and even imprisoned for not keeping their children in school or co-operating with the school in the proper disciplining of the child. We find that the judicial inquiry of the court and various forms of probation are quite effective. In discipline the general orderly process of our schools does not imply much corporal punishment; in fact, it is quite a rare thing for a corporal-punishment report to be sent in to my office; the requirement that this be done is also another of the deterrent influences against excessive corporal punishment. I may say in general that I am very reluctant to have corporal punishment used, but I believe that "a rod in pickle" in the present state of society is necessary for the maintenance of good order.

EBENEZER MACKEY, Supervising Principal, Board of Education,
Trenton, N. J.:

December 16, 1907.

Mr. NATHAN S. JONAS,

Department of Education,

Park Ave. and 59th St., New York City.

MY DEAR MR. JONAS: Anything that I may have to say in reply to yours of Dec. 7th is somewhat in the nature of a snap judgment and should be discounted as such. I have not had occasion to give the matter of corporal punishment sufficient consideration to warrant me in feeling that my present views are final. I am open to conviction. I should think that you would find stronger arguments pro and con by conferring with the teachers and the principals who are most immediately concerned in cases of discipline. However, I shall give you my opinion on each of the questions submitted in your recent circular.

1. No, except under such special restrictions as to be nearly, if not altogether, prohibitive. The exception would be in special or parental schools, under the advice of an expert, and the punishment to be administered by some one who really loves and understands the child.

2. So far as my observation goes, corporal punishment is rarely if ever needed. I have never seen a case of discipline in which I was convinced that better results could not have been secured in some other way than

by corporal punishment. In the great majority of cases under my observation, I have evidence that the corporal punishment was not administered in the right spirit and did not receive the right response.

3. No; corporal punishment is forbidden by the School Law of the State and by the local Board of Education.

4. The discipline in the public schools of this city is generally very good. I have had no opportunity to observe the effect of the change or to make comparisons. Corporal punishment had been abolished in this city long before I took charge of the schools, and it had also been abolished in Reading, Pa., long before I became superintendent there. I have found the order fully as good in these two cities where corporal punishment is forbidden as in another city in which I was superintendent where it was permitted and practiced.

5. I have had no evidence of such an effect, nor have I been able to trace any want of order or respect to such a cause. The fact that under the same restrictions as to corporal punishment, and with the same pupils one teacher secures order and respect, and another may fail, seems to show that the personality of the teacher is the main factor in the problem, and that corporal punishment can be eliminated.

6. I believe in encouragement and in incentives rather than in penalties. I am not opposed to corporal punishment in itself, but I believe that there is such danger in its enforcement that it is wise to prohibit it in the public schools by law. There are so many kinds of home training, the children themselves differ so widely, that the incentives and deterrents must vary to suit the differences in the individuals. As a pupil in public school I remember receiving corporal punishment three times. Two incidents I have never been able to justify, and in one, while the punishment was just under the rules, and effective, the result might have been accomplished in some other way. In matters of discipline, as a child at home, I remember that for mother to be grieved at what I did had vastly more effect than for her to be angry. There was no greater deterrent in my life than the fear of hurting mother's feelings. For her to say an act of mine was mean or dishonorable affected me more than being whipped. If corporal punishment is to be administered as a necessity of school discipline, it seems to me that it would be preferable to have it administered by the parent, or by the teacher with the consent of the parents, and under special restrictions as to the time, the character, the cause and the amount.

I should like to refer you to the principals of our schools, whose opinions, on account of the nature of their experiences, should have more value than mine.

Sincerely yours,

E. MACKEY.

J. P. CARR, Superintendent of Schools, Vicksburg, Miss.:

1. I do not.

2. It is degrading to pupil and teacher alike, for most teachers inflict it only when angry. As a rule the children who come under the rod are whipped at home, and "a beating," as they call it, only hardens them.

3. It is practised in our schools as a last resort, and with the implied consent of the parents. By implied consent I mean that they are supposed to notify teachers if they do not want it inflicted upon their children.

4. Corporal punishment has not been abolished.

6. I have been connected with the schools only this the second year as superintendent. As principal of the High School for Boys I abolished it to a great extent in the building I had in charge.

It is allowed by the Board, to be used sparingly. I think it will finally be abolished in the schools. What to take its place? Private heart to heart talks with the offenders. Co-operation of parents.

H. B. WORK, Superintendent of Schools, Wheeling, W. Va.:

1. Yes. To a limited extent.

2. It saves many a boy to the school who would otherwise have to be expelled. It is to my mind a necessary resource to many teachers who have not yet developed their strength in discipline. A resort sometimes to corporal punishment saves a young teacher from failure.

3. Yes. Rule 84: "Teachers shall enforce proper discipline in their respective rooms, and shall avoid corporal punishment in cases where good order and obedience can be secured by milder means. Corporal punishment shall never be inflicted when the teacher is in anger, and never on the head of the pupil. Corporal punishment in all cases shall be inflicted with a strap not exceeding two feet in length, and one and one-quarter inch in width at the large end, tapering to a width of about one-quarter inch at the smaller end."—*Rules of Board of Education*.

GEO. W. TWITMYER, Superintendent of Schools, Wilmington, Del.:

1. To a limited extent; only when all other means fail.

3. To a limited extent; under the direction of the principal, and then only for violent refractory conduct.

JOHN J. BLAIR, Superintendent of Schools, Wilmington, N. C.:

1. I do.

2. There is some penalty which should stand as a severe punishment for grievous offenses, such as impertinence and the offering of insult to a lady teacher.

3. It is seldom practised, but left with principals and the superintendent.

5. I know of instances in which this is true.

6. If the boy is whipped on the right place he will never go home and show the marks.

I have only whipped three boys in five years, but having the authority to do so has a fine "deterrent effect."

HOMER P. LEWIS, Superintendent of Schools, Worcester, Mass.:

1. Yes.

2. It is often less injurious in its effects than other forms of punishment. It best meets the impertinent and defiant attitude on the part of the pupil. Where corporal punishment is not allowed in the schools, in a majority of cases parents inflict corporal punishment for school offenses, but not so wisely as the teachers. As obedience is the chief virtue of the child, the discipline that best secures this is best.

3. Yes. I enclose extract from rules.*

4. In Omaha, where I was principal of the High School, it seemed to me that pupils came to the High School in a very unfortunate attitude of mind. We tried to allow the greatest freedom possible, but many of the boys had not learned to obey promptly, which is the basis of freedom, and hence caused more trouble in their first year than all of the other pupils. I attributed the fact to the abolition of corporal punishment.

5. I think it did at Omaha.

*Extract from rules not received.

SUMMARY

SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS IN NEW YORK CITY

	In favor of corporal punishment	Opposed to corporal punishment
Associate City Superintendents.....	2	4
District Superintendents.....	9	10
Training and High Schools, Manhattan.....	3	3
Elementary Schools, Manhattan.....	64	85
High School, The Bronx.....		1
Elementary Schools, The Bronx.....	11	15
Training and High Schools, Brooklyn.....	5	1
Elementary and Truant Schools, Brooklyn...	70	45
High Schools, Queens.....	2	
Elementary Schools, Queens.....	26	12
High School, Richmond.....	1	
Elementary Schools, Richmond.....	15	5
	208	181
Of those who requested that their answers be considered <i>confidential</i> :		
In favor of corporal punishment.....		18
Opposed to corporal punishment.....		5
Of all the answers received:		
In favor of corporal punishment—		
Women		64
Men		162
		226
Opposed to corporal punishment—		
Women		109
Men		77
		186

NOTE—Two principals who responded gave no answers to the questions submitted.

SUPERINTENDENTS OF OTHER CITIES

In favor of corporal punishment.....	44
Opposed to corporal punishment.....	14

NOTE—Three superintendents did not answer the questions submitted, but forwarded copies of rules permitting corporal punishment in their schools.

RECAPITULATION

Total number of answers received.....	470
In favor of corporal punishment.....	270
Opposed to corporal punishment.....	200

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Report of the Special Committee on Corporal Punishment adopted by the Board of Education on January 8, 1908:

To the Board of Education:

The Special Committee appointed in pursuance of a resolution adopted on September 25, 1907 (see Journal, page 2039), to inquire and report back to the Board of Education whether the abolition of corporal punishment in the public schools has been beneficial or detrimental in maintaining order and respect, etc., respectfully submits the following preliminary report:

In pursuing its inquiries your Committee prepared a set of questions relating to corporal punishment and submitted the same to all superintendents and principals in our public school system, and also to the superintendents of schools in the larger cities throughout the country. In addition to the answers furnished to these questions, much unsolicited information has been received. The signed statements having developed so much that is important to the welfare of our system, apart from the main question of corporal punishment, the Committee believes it to be very desirable that every member of the Board of Education should have an opportunity of examining the evidence submitted on both sides of the question, in order that the matter may be discussed and disposed of with the fullest possible knowledge of all the facts and opinions adduced when the final report with the Committee's conclusions is presented.

Your Committee therefore requests the privilege of printing in pamphlet form all the answers received to its inquiries, except such as have been sent in confidence, with the intention that a complete copy shall be placed in the hands of every member of the Board of Education. With this end in view the following resolution is submitted for adoption:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Corporal Punishment be authorized to print in pamphlet form five hundred copies of the answers received to its inquiries on the subject of corporal punishment, except those which the Committee has been requested to consider as confidential, that the Committee on Supplies make the necessary arrangements for such printing, and that copies of the pamphlet be forwarded to all the members of the Board of Education.

NATHAN S. JONAS,	}	<i>Special Committee</i> <i>on</i> <i>Corporal Punishment.</i>
D. J. McDONALD, M.D.,		
GEORGE A. VANDENHOFF,		

QUESTIONS

Questions submitted to superintendents and principals in New York City:

1. Do you favor corporal punishment in our schools? (Answer "yes" or "no.")
2. Please give reasons for or against.
3. If your answer is "yes," please describe the form of corporal punishment preferred and the conditions under which you would have the same administered.
4. Do you find the discipline better or worse since the abolition of corporal punishment?
5. Do you believe that the knowledge on the part of pupils that no corporal punishment can be inflicted interferes with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the schools?
6. If you are opposed to corporal punishment, but believe that some other form of punishment should be devised to take its place for deterrent effect, please make suggestions.

Questions submitted to superintendents of schools in other cities:

1. Do you believe in corporal punishment in public schools?
2. Please give reasons for or against.
3. Is corporal punishment practiced in the public schools of your City, and if so, under what restrictions?
4. If corporal punishment has been abolished, do you find the discipline better or worse since its abolition?
5. If corporal punishment has been abolished, does the knowledge on the part of the pupils that such punishment cannot be inflicted interfere with the proper maintenance of order and respect in the schools?
6. If you are opposed to corporal punishment, but believe that some other form of punishment should be devised to take its place for deterrent effect, please make suggestions.

